



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2007

No. 17

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN BAIRD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: "Stern as death is love, relentless as the nether world is devotion; its flames are a blazing fire. Dry waters cannot quench love, nor floods sweep it away."

Lord God, Your word strikes to the heart. One is not deceived by love and devotion, for true love expands one's vision and moves one to be focused beyond self-interest.

Measure our faith and commitment to truth by the intensity and sincerity of our love and devotion. May our love of country and devotion to the work of government lead us to a deeper respect for people and for other nations and cultures as well.

Help this Nation create systems of communication, reconciliation and collaboration that will confirm love and build trust now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN BULGARIA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I participated in the American University in Bulgaria's Board of Trustees meetings. I am honored to serve on the board which promotes world-class education for students throughout Eastern Europe.

This September marks the university's 16th year. The first American-style undergraduate liberal arts educational institution in Eastern Europe, AUBG has more than quadrupled in size since its opening. University President Michael Easton, Provost Ann Ferren, and Chairman of the Board David Glanagán are to be commended for their dedication to AUBG and their vision for its future.

As the people of Bulgaria continue their democratic transformation, AUBG's mission statement best exemplifies the institution's commitment to Bulgaria's prosperity. The mission of the American University in Bulgaria is to educate future leaders committed to serving the needs of the region by promoting the values of an open, democratic society.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Robert Drinan, or Father Robert Drinan as he was always known, the only priest to serve in the House of Representatives. He was the colleague of many who are still in the House. He was my own colleague at Georgetown Law School where he served on the faculty after he left the Congress.

Father Drinan, while he was in Congress, wore his priestly garb because he always considered himself a priest, but when asked why he did not put on civilian clothes, he said, "It's the only clothes I have." And they were.

He bowed to the discipline of his church when the ruling came down that priests should not serve in a legislative body. He took many of the concerns he had brought to this floor with him into books and studies, particularly in the field of international human rights.

I am beginning work on a resolution in honor of Father Drinan. He has already been honored by this House with the Congressional Distinguished Service Award.

We are going to be on a retreat on Thursday. I hope that we can make some arrangements so that many of us who would want to attend the funeral on Thursday may do that and then go to the retreat.

I will save further remarks for such time as a resolution or other fitting period of memorial for Father Drinan is offered here on the House floor.

SEND ME HOME SO I WON'T GO TO JAIL

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, crimes by illegals continue to plague American cities.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H947

Jose Vallejo is another illegal charged with a vicious crime, this time rape of a 4-year-old in Illinois. The judge in that case set a \$150,000 bond, and the defendant actually made the bond; but ICE arrested the individual and took him to an immigration judge for deportation. Vallejo begged the immigration judge to deport him so he wouldn't have to be tried in Illinois for the State charge. The judge, unaware of the rape charges, agreed and ordered Vallejo immediately deported back to Mexico. But before Vallejo could pull off this legalized jail break from Illinois, he was rearrested to stand charges on the rape case.

Federal authorities should not order illegals like Vallejo deported until they have been tried and served prison time for their crimes in State criminal courts; then they should be deported, otherwise more illegals will agree to be deported before their criminal trials and try to fraudulently avoid U.S. justice and the consequences of their crimes by hiding in their own homeland.

And that's just the way it is.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 92

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this weekend over 300 Members of the House violated the House rules. They did so not with malice or any intent to violate the rules, but they did so because of the hubris of the leadership of the House.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit Members from taking nongovernmental aircraft by any organization, any corporation that has a lobbyist. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that there are lobbyists for United Airlines, Delta, U.S. Air and a litany of other airlines. These rules are unfair, unreasonable and unenforceable, but they have not yet been changed; and under a closed rule, it was a take-it-or-leave-it on the entire package.

Mr. Speaker, I submitted for the House H. Res. 92 in order to clarify and reform these foolish, foolish rules that were instituted without any debate, without any hearings, and even without much notice. I would ask the House to seriously consider, Is it time to begin being honest and reputable? Isn't there a time to not break the rules and say, "But everyone's doing it"?

DEMOCRATS' BROKEN PROMISES

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last year, Democrats promised the most bipartisan Congress ever in the history of our Congress. What we have seen so far is about as far from that as I could imagine. Not only have the rules been broken in terms of bills being rammed through, not going through regular

order so that there can be debate and discussions, but even when there are bills that all Members can support, albeit that they are not as strong as we would like, they are mischaracterized.

Over the weekend, I read most of the debate that went on last week about H.R. 476 dealing with ethics reform in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "Please take note. The Democratic leadership of this institution plans to clean up the criminal and ethical morass it inherited. This bill is a down payment on the new ethical climate control system we are building."

"The American people deserve to know that criminal unethical behavior by any of our colleagues will be punished and that the penalties for violating the sacred trust which has been bestowed upon us by our voters and the States we represent will be substantive, serious and not window dressing."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, we passed a bill tougher than the bill that was passed last week in the last Congress, and we don't need to keep making these kinds of comments if we want a bipartisan relationship.

SPRAY PAINTING THE CAPITOL

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday tens of thousands of protesters protested on the National Mall the war on Iraq, and in particular, the 21,500 troop surge. These Americans exercised their first amendment right, and indeed, I am grateful to live in a Nation where we can protest government policies. However, my colleagues, I read in The Hill newspaper one troubling incident that arose. It says, 300 self-described anarchists spray-painted symbols and slogans on the west front steps of the United States Capitol building.

More puzzling, the article says that helpless Capitol Police officers watched, reporting that they were ordered to avoid confronting the group. It seems U.S. Capitol Police Chief Philip Morse defends that the graffiti was "easily removed" and, most significantly, the building was secure from the artists' entry.

I am not sure I agree with such dismissiveness. Protected free speech does not include vandalism. I ask the Speaker to investigate. Peacefully assembling to protest is permissible, defacing public property is unacceptable and it should not happen again.

PROTESTERS LOSE CIVILITY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the subject of Iraq and the war in Iraq, the global war on terror, is in-

deed a subject that is a tense subject, it is a difficult subject. In districts like mine, with Fort Campbell, with our National Guard men and women, it is one that we talk about a lot.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I do fear is that in this debate, as we talk about it, we have lost civility in this debate. It has been of great concern to me that I have heard of some of the actions of the protesters who came to our Nation's capital this weekend. I am deeply disturbed by the report of a veteran who was counterprotesting the protesters that were here, and he was spat upon by those protesters, spat upon, a man who fought for our freedom, to protect the freedom that allows them to have a protest. That is shameful, and they should be ashamed; they should be dealt with.

You know, one of the things that we continue to hear from the Iraqis is, do not leave us until we are stable. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that we need to remember. It is imperative that we make certain that they move to stability and productivity.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 26, 2007, at 11:30 am:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 188.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1415

LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 521) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the “Lane Evans Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Lane Evans Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues and particularly the original cosponsor of this resolution, Mr. HARE of Illinois, in the consideration of H.R. 521, legislation naming a postal facility in Rock Island, Illinois, after former Member of Congress Lane Evans. This measure, sponsored by Mr. HARE, was unanimously supported by our committee and has the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Illinois delegation.

Mr. Evans proudly served our country as a Marine during the Vietnam War and was an outspoken voice for all veterans in the House of Representatives. During his 24-year political career, he sought aid for homeless vets, championed benefits for soldiers exposed to Agent Orange, and was an early critic of the Iraq War. He chaired the Vietnam-Era Veterans Caucus and was the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, where his service is fondly remembered.

Mr. Evans' ability to keep in close contact with his constituents made him an effective and compassionate legislator. He fought hard for working families and was a strong, progressive leader in the Congress. He continued his dedicated service while fighting Parkinson's disease for the past decade, and his presence is already very much missed in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE), cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for bringing this measure to the floor; and I thank the gentleman from the great State of Illinois and coauthor of H.R. 521, my friend, Mr. RAY LAHOOD, for his leadership and the Illinois delegation for their support.

Thanks also to the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. WAXMAN;

and Mr. DANNY DAVIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia; and to the leadership for their consideration of this tribute to a great Congressman, Lane Evans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one more deserving of this recognition than Congressman Lane Evans. On January 17, Mr. LAHOOD and I introduced this bill, and within days we received overwhelming support in favor of this legislation. To date, 82 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors of H.R. 521. Not only have Members of Congress expressed support for the bill, but it has also been well-received by staff members; one staff member saying “Anything for Lane” and another stating, “He’s a great man who I have tremendous respect and admiration for.”

We all know what kind of man Lane is, but for those who have yet to make his acquaintance, I am honored to have the opportunity to share with you the story of a very rare politician.

I met Lane on the campaign trail back in 1976. We were two young dreamers with the mutual goal of making a difference in this world. Soon after the election, we became a team. I traveled with Lane from one end of the district to another as he provided his legal services to working families, children and the poor. I can recall many times when Lane offered his services free of charge to elderly men and women in need of a will. It was not too long before the people of the 17th District of Illinois rewarded Lane for his sacrifices, his commitment to hard work and hardworking families.

In 1982, Lane ran for the congressional seat of the 17th District of Illinois. At the time, the manufacturing industry of western Illinois was suffering from an economic recession which left many looking for a new direction in representation. Lane’s populist message, coupled with his plain-spoken personal integrity resonated with the people, and at only 31 years of age, this young legal services attorney was able to win the majority of the votes, which had been reserved for a Republican candidate for more than a century.

Mr. Speaker, Lane has succeeded in politics by following the Marine motto, Semper Fi, always faithful to his principles, to his constituents and to himself. For 12 elections the people of the 17th District sent Lane back to Washington with confidence that he would represent their interests.

The secret to Lane’s success was the value he placed in their trust. He never took the people who elected him for granted, and it showed. To anyone that walked through his door, Lane and his

staff were always ready, willing and able to go the extra mile in assisting them.

Although Lane was a man who delivered on his promises to bring jobs, he also had three outpatient clinics built, and what mattered most to the people was the manner in which he represented them. What always struck me most about Lane was the humility he showed.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to speak this morning on behalf of the wonderful Congressman, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 521.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, Ms. HOLMES NORTON for bringing this measure to the floor of the House. I thank the gentleman from the great State of Illinois and co-author of H.R. 521, Mr. LAHOOD, for his leadership and the Illinois Delegation for their support. Thanks to the distinguished Chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. DANNY DAVIS, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia. And to the Leadership for their consideration of this tribute to Congressman Lane Evans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the “Lane Evans Post Office Building”.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one more deserving of this recognition than Congressman Lane Evans. On January 17, Mr. LAHOOD and I introduced this bill and within days we received overwhelming support in favor of the legislation. To date, 82 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors of H.R. 521. Not only have Members of Congress expressed support for the bill, but it has also been well-received by staff members, one staff member saying “Anything for Lane” and another stating “He’s a great man who I have tremendous respect and admiration for”.

We all know what kind of man Lane is, but for those who have yet to make his acquaintance, I am honored that I have the opportunity to share with you the story of this rare politician.

I met Lane on the campaign trail back in 1976. We were two young dreamers with the mutual goal of making a difference in the world. Soon after the election, we became a team. I traveled with Lane from one end of the district to another as he provided his legal services to working families, children and the poor. I can recall many times when Lane offered his services free of charge to elderly men and women in need of a will. It was not too long before the people of the 17th district of Illinois rewarded him for his sacrifices and commitment to hard working families.

In 1982, Lane ran for the congressional seat of the 17th district of Illinois. At the time, the manufacturing industry of western Illinois was suffering from an economic recession, which left many looking for a new direction in representation. Lane’s populist message coupled with his plain-spoken personal integrity resonated with the people, and at only 31 years of age, this young legal services attorney was able to win the majority of the votes, which had been reserved for a Republican candidate for more than a century.

Following the election, Lane asked me to represent him as his District Director. I was flattered that Lane thought so highly of me and entrusted me with the care of his constituency. I accepted because Lane promised me that I would never have to lie, and I can proudly say that in 24 years he kept his promise. It was not too difficult because even those who disagreed with Lane respected him and his commitment to serving on behalf of the middle class family.

Mr. Speaker, Lane has succeeded in politics by following the Marine motto, "Semper Paratus". Throughout his career, he has been "always faithful" to his principles, to his constituents and to himself. For 12 elections the people of the 17th sent Lane back to Washington with confidence that he would represent their interests. The secret to Lane's success was the value he placed in their trust. He never took the people who elected him for granted, and it showed. He prided himself on maintaining a first-rate constituent service program. To anyone that walked through his door, Lane and his staff were always ready, willing, and able to go the extra mile in assisting them.

Although Lane was a man who delivered on his promises to bring jobs to the Rock Island Arsenal and build veteran outpatient clinics, what mattered most to the people was the manner in which he represented them. What has always struck me most about Lane was the humility he showed towards everyone he knew. To everyone he was just Lane. He was more than a Congressman to the people of the 17th district, he was a friend.

Mr. Speaker, Lane's sincere rapport with people was not limited to the 17th district. As a Vietnam era veteran of the Marine Corps himself, Lane had the remarkable ability to relate to our service men and women. His career in Congress is marked with legislative victories on behalf of the Nation's 24 million veterans.

Always a man of great conviction, Lane challenged those who ignored the harmful effects of Agent Orange exposure. Eventually, Lane was successful in his effort to pass legislation awarding compensation to vets exposed to Agent Orange. In the 108th Congress, he built on that legislative milestone by winning passage of a law that delivers health and compensation benefits to children of veterans exposed to Agent Orange who were born with spina bifida, representing the first time children of veterans will receive government benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Lane's crusade for veterans did not stop there. He was one of the first Congressional voices to speak out about problems experienced by Persian Gulf veterans, what is now known as the Gulf War syndrome. He also pushed Congress to increase funding for veterans programs, which were so important to him because they delivered needed government services to working class families.

At the end of the 109th Congress, Lane retired after serving 24 years as a distinguished Member of Congress. It was a sad day for veterans and the people of the 17th district of Illinois when Lane announced he would not run for reelection, but no one was more disappointed than Lane. In spite of all his legislative accomplishments, Lane still felt there was so much more that he could have done.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my first legislative action will be to honor my good friend and mentor, Congressman Lane Evans. My only hope is that when I leave this body I can

do half the things that Lane has done for the 17th district, the State of Illinois, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 521.

Lane, thank you for your support throughout the years. It means more to me than you will ever know.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521 to rename the post office in Rock Island, Illinois, for Congressman Lane Evans.

The Congressman was born in 1951 in Rock Island, Illinois. Mr. Evans grew up the son of a firefighter and joined the Marines out of high school and fought in the Vietnam War. After that, he earned an undergraduate degree from Augustana College and a law degree from Georgetown.

Just 4 years later, he found himself in the House of Representatives, a Democrat representing a largely Republican 17th District of Illinois, where he quickly developed a reputation as an advocate for regular Americans.

Known in his district, which covers Moline, Rock Island, Quincy, Decatur, Galesburg, and parts of Springfield and the Quad Cities, for excellent constituent services, he also fought hard for working families and especially for veterans. He became chairman of the Vietnam-Era Veterans Caucus here in the Congress, where he pushed for legislation particularly to improve health care for vets and those with disabilities such as post-traumatic stress syndrome. That disorder today still affects many Americans of that era. He also supported legislation to eliminate land mines and assist land mine victims, and later he helped those affected with Gulf War syndrome.

After Hurricane Katrina, long into a debilitating disease, he fought hard to make things right for those people affected so desperately by the hurricanes.

Even after being diagnosed in 1995 with Parkinson's, he continued to serve for another six terms in the House and served with great distinction, never giving up the fight.

In his final term, the Congressman and I had the pleasure of flying for over 14 hours across the United States and all the way to Iwo Jima to commemorate the 60th commemoration of that great battle. He did so at a time in which he needed a physician's assistant, in which he was uncomfortable at all times, and in which most men afflicted with Parkinson's would never have considered such a trip. He did so because, first of all, he was a Marine. He did so, secondly, because he cared so much about this country and about the battles that men and women had fought for this country.

I will remember Congressman Lane Evans for that trip. For someone who went above and beyond what the public saw to do what was right and what was important, even while putting himself in tremendous potential physical harm

for those long hours in an aircraft is something that most Members with less afflictions would not have done.

I will remember him, and I ask that all Members vote positively on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to not only thank the gentleman from California but to just for the record state that in calling Mr. HARE I was calling him out of order. I was yielding him part of my time, because you, of course, by rights were entitled to the next speaker, and I appreciate your statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding; and I also want to thank Congressman HARE for bringing this issue forward. Having worked with Congressman HARE over the last month or so, I know he is going to fill the shoes of Congressman Evans and fight for veterans issues. I really appreciate that.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 521, designating the post office in Rock Island, Illinois, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building. It is right that we should honor Congressman Lane Evans.

Lane Evans will be known for the years he spent fighting for veterans and their families and for attacking issues like mental health, toxic exposure and homelessness. These issues were once brushed aside. Now, because of Lane Evans, we face them and we deal with them. Because of Lane Evans, many Americans will lead healthier and better lives.

He never sacrificed what he felt was important. He always remembered why he came to Washington and who sent him here.

Even though he is no longer in Congress, I know that he will continue to fight for what he believes in. His influence will be felt in all the work that we do for the rest of our times here in Congress.

Congressman Evans has been a mentor to me and many others in this body. It is an honor for me to speak in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 521 honoring our dear friend and colleague and fighter for our veterans.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure that I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), one of the Members who knew Lane Evans both as a staff member here on the Hill and then as a fellow colleague.

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman HARE for reintroducing this bill.

Last year, when Congressman Evans announced that he was leaving the House because of his very debilitating illness, Parkinson's disease, I introduced a bill, along with the rest of my

colleagues from Illinois, to name the post office in Rock Island in honor of Lane. I did that because I met Lane Evans when he was a young, energetic, enthusiastic young man in 1982 running for Congress.

At the time, I happened to be working for the sitting Congressman from that district, a fellow by the name of Congressman Tom Railsback. It was Lane's good fortune that Mr. Railsback lost his primary to a very conservative Republican, and that opened the opportunity, as Phil knows, for Lane to win that seat that had been held for a long, long time by Republicans.

Since the time that Lane Evans was elected to Congress, he has distinguished himself with really three particular groups of people in the 17th District. He has been a voice for those people, particularly, in the 17th District who might not have had a voice here in Washington; and I speak of senior citizens who he is beloved by. I speak of veterans who he is equally beloved by, and I speak of the hardworking men and women, the blue-collar workers of the 17th District. Those are the people that Lane Evans truly represented in Washington, D.C., in a way that distinguished his career for 24 years here in the House, but, more importantly, back in the western part of Illinois in a way that I think will not be replicated.

Lane was probably one of the hardest-working congressmen, but he is someone who never forgot where he came from. He grew up in Rock Island. He was educated, at least his undergraduate degree, in Rock Island; and he continued to travel back and forth to his district every weekend. That is what made him so popular.

When people would come to me and talk to me about the idea of running against Lane as a Republican, I have told people the story that I think there are some people in politics that are impossible to beat, and Lane Evans was one of those people.

□ 1430

The only way that Lane would ever leave this place would be voluntarily, which he did at the end of the last term. But it was because of his hard work and his dedication to senior citizens, to veterans and to hardworking blue-collar people in the western part of Illinois that made him a politician and a public servant that set the highest standard possible, a standard that all of us can look to in doing our work.

So the least we can do today is name the post office in Rock Island in his honor. I am sure there will be many other honors bestowed upon him. I don't know if Lane is watching this from a television in his home in Moline; but if he is, I want him to know this is one Republican in the House that has great admiration and great respect for him because of the work that he did, and because of the way he represented people from western Illinois.

We wish him Godspeed. We wish him good health. We want him to know

that he is in our thoughts and prayers today as we vote on the bill to honor him, but we will long remember his distinguished service and long continue to pray that he will have the healing hand of God placed on his shoulder.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support this bill. I want to commend Representative HARE and Representative LAHOOD for their support on this bill, and I appreciate their eloquence in support of a truly great man and a great friend.

I was on the staff of Congressman Joe Moakley of Massachusetts when Lane Evans first came to Washington. Immediately, Joe knew that he had a new ally in the fight to protect human rights in El Salvador. Lane regularly met with people from Central America here in Washington and in his district. He traveled to the region, did his homework, and became an active Member in the effort to change U.S. policy and bring peace to that troubled region.

As a marine who served in Vietnam, Lane chaired the Vietnam Era Veterans Caucus in the House. Having seen war up close and personal, he worked with David Bonior, Jack Quinn, Senator LEAHY and Senator HAGEL and the Vietnam Veterans of America to push for a U.S. and international ban on the production and use of anti-personnel landmines. When I was privileged to be elected to Congress in 1996, one of the first things I did was go to Lane Evans and pledge my support for his work on landmines.

Lane's personal experience made him the champion of two other important causes. As the son of a union member, Lane consistently spoke out against the abuses facing so many workers around the world as they struggled to achieve their most basic rights. As a veteran himself, he made sure that we don't treat with suspicion the questions raised by those returning from war, whether on the effects of agent orange, gulf war syndrome or post-traumatic stress; and we must never reward their service with neglect, homelessness, underfunded health care, or reduced benefits.

When I think of Lane Evans, I think of an easy-going, likeable Midwesterner. I also think of courage and conviction in how he lives his own life and how he continues to confront the challenges facing America.

Mr. Speaker, I miss his voice and his presence in this House, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my thanks to the honorable Lane Evans and urge passage of this bill to name a U.S. post office in his hometown of Rock Island, Illinois, in his honor.

Lane's service to America and its veterans began with his enlistment in the Marine Corps in the Vietnam War. Lane began his congressional career by winning election for the 17th District in Illinois in 1982 and promptly became a staunch advocate for veterans. He kept this commitment through the 109th Congress.

This bill will provide a small but important recognition of Lane's service and commitment. He championed issues such as agent orange, women's health care, spina bifida benefits and many others.

We hear a lot about bipartisanship in this body, and truly I had the opportunity to win a special election, came up, and one of the first people that I met as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee was Lane Evans.

As soon as he realized that I was certainly willing and wanted to help veterans, then nobody could have been any nicer. Nobody could have extended any more help than Lane Evans.

It is sad, sad and not sad, I have mixed emotions, certainly, about Democrats taking control of the House, but it is sad that with his retirement his picture will not be on the wall. Because of his hard work, he certainly very much deserves that sort of honor.

On the other hand, like I say, nobody, nobody has worked any harder and done a better job for our Nation's veterans. I certainly urge passage of this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to grant the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) 2 minutes, noting that in the Iraq war he has lost more than any other Member, more members from his district than any other district in the United States.

Therefore, I know he feels strongly about Lane, who devoted his entire time in the Congress to focusing on veterans and their needs.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman from the District of Columbia for allowing me to say a few words to express my deepest appreciation to the gentleman that I have known for years now, since becoming a Member of this great institution.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois, my good friend Mr. HARE, for sponsoring this legislation, and the spirit of bipartisanship, knowing that our Republican Members also have said nothing but praise for the legacy of this great American and as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I had some long discussions with this gentleman, Mr. Evans. In the years past, he came to Vietnam in 1969, and I was just there the year

before, from 1967 to 1968, in that terrible conflict.

If there is anything that I would like to say, point out not only his leadership, but the service of this great American to our Nation, as the senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I want to say that Mr. Evans, in my humble opinion, is certainly one of the great leaders and advocates of the needs of our veterans throughout the country.

It was one experience, as our good friend from California mentioned, that they went with Mr. Evans to Iwo Jima. He came to my district. If anybody wants to share that sense of experience, well, you have to fly 15 hours to get to my district. Mr. Evans was willing to make that kind of a sacrifice just to see that, as small as my district may be, we have about 3,000 to 4,000 veterans living in my district, and he felt it was important enough for him to come and see and hear some of the concerns that our veterans have in my district.

I want to say to my colleagues and the Members of this House how fitting it is. I wish we could do more than just naming this post office after this great American Congressman, Lane Evans. I hope if there is a chance he might be listening to this proceeding, I just want to express and let him know how much I love him, not only as a friend but a truly great American.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from American Samoa, I too agree with you that a post office is just a good first down payment for somebody who did so much for veterans; and I, for one, look forward to finding a veterans facility somewhere in the United States or a hospital for veterans that would be fitting and appropriate for the man who would be the chairman of the Veterans' Committee were he still in the Congress.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and achievements of my dear friend, Lane Evans.

For the past quarter of a century, Congressman Evans led efforts on behalf of veterans, including the fight to give Filipino veterans the benefits that they had been promised. He also became legendary in his advocacy for our nation's middle class. As a champion of these causes he earned the respect of America's veterans and their families.

He also stood as a tireless champion in the fight to provide justice for over 200,000 "comfort women" who were forced into sex slavery by the Japanese Imperial Army during World War II. He has been a voice for these voiceless women who are still holding out hope that they will receive a formal apology from the Japanese government for the indignity they suffered. I have assured him that I will do my best to continue his work and legacy on this issue after his retirement this year.

Today I am pleased to vote in favor of naming a Post Office after a man who deserves our greatest respect. Mr. Speaker, for his leadership, mentorship and companionship, for his work on behalf of those who would have otherwise been forgotten, and for his unparal-

leled work these past 24 years, I emphatically raise my voice in support of naming a Post Office after my friend, Congressman Lane Evans.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill designating the post office located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building". I want to thank Congressman PHIL HARE, the former District Director to Lane Evans and the new Representative from Illinois' 17th Congressional District. The post office is located in Lane Evans' hometown of Rock Island and will serve as a testament to his long, distinguished career as a Marine, a champion for social justice and a fine Member of this body.

Today's debate gives us the opportunity to take a moment to recognize and thank Lane Evans for his service to this country, to this Congress and to our nation's men and women who have worn the uniform. I have had the honor and the privilege of serving with Lane on the Veterans Affairs Committee since I came to Congress in 1993. He is a good friend, an important ally and an unwavering advocate for Veterans in Illinois and across the nation. Although he never was able to chair the House Veterans Committee, he stands as one of this body's finest and most committed legislators for veterans. He made the issues of veterans health care and veterans benefits the cornerstone of his legislative career, and I could think of no better way to honor Lane than for this Congress to continue that fight.

While Lane may have been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, it did not affect his razor sharp intellect or lessen his commitment to the issues he cares about. He has approached his disease with dignity, class and courage, and he has served as an inspiration to others with Parkinson's disease. This Congress, I am going to miss having my friend and my colleague in the Illinois delegation, but you can bet when I need guidance about the best way to protect Illinois veterans, my first call will be to Lane.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do today is pass this bill honoring Lane Evans and his career, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, legislation to name a Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois after recently retired Congressman Lane Evans. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, as Lane has been my great friend and colleague over the last 18 years. I would like to thank Congressman HARE for introducing this bill, and as glad as we are to have him join us in the House, this institution misses Lane Evans. We miss his leadership, we miss his quiet dignity, and we miss his advocacy for veterans and working people. This is a small gesture, but it is a way to honor his dedicated service to our country.

Lane devoted most of his entire professional life to service to the United States of America. He grew up in Rock Island and entered the Marine Corps out of high school, serving in Vietnam. When he returned, he went to college and earned his law degree at Georgetown, and worked as a legal aid attorney before he was elected to Congress in 1982.

During his tenure in Congress, Lane put his head down and worked hard, not seeking attention for the many legislative victories he achieved, particularly in the realm of veterans'

issues. Because of Lane, affected veterans are compensated for their exposure to Agent Orange, and he led efforts to learn more about Gulf War Illness and ban land mines. Lane was awarded the Vietnam Veterans of America's first annual President's Award for Outstanding Achievement in 1990 and he received the AMVET's Silver Helmet Award in 1994, known as the "Oscar" of veterans' honors.

Lane was also a tireless protector of the rights of working people, fighting for fair trade, a fair minimum wage and the right to collectively bargain. He worked for a cleaner environment and the protection of the family farm.

Over the last 8 years, Lane has faced another battle, this one against Parkinson's disease. The dignity with which he has faced this disease has inspired many, and helped educate the public, and the Congress, about the disease. You would never know how difficult a disease Parkinson's is by watching Lane. He does not complain, he just keeps going forward, helping people at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans has given a tremendous amount to the United States of America, and we owe him our gratitude. Naming this post office after him assures that his contributions will live on for succeeding generations to appreciate. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I thank Lane for his continuing friendship.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 521, a measure to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building." Indeed, I wholeheartedly support Congressman PHIL HARE in his efforts to bring this measure to the floor today and I appreciate his quick actions on this matter. As many know, Mr. HARE was the District Director of Congressman Evans for many years and now represents the 17th district of Illinois himself, the district that Lane Evans represented for 24 years.

Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans served with distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1982; he was elected 12 times in a row by the good people of the 17th district of Illinois. Indeed, they proudly sent their best from the heartland America to serve America.

Lane has always been a champion for working families, students, servicemembers, veterans and military families. He went to college and law school on the GI Bill and returned to Illinois to be a legal aid lawyer, representing the less fortunate among us.

A Marine Corps veteran of the Vietnam era and a senior member of both the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, Lane Evans's advocacy and record in the Congress on behalf of the military and veterans is admirable and unquestioned.

There is no federal program for veterans which does not bear his mark of oversight and improvement. Simply put, veterans enjoy increased education benefits, improved health care access and services, a strengthened home loan program, judicial review of their benefits claims, additional opportunities for veteran-owned small businesses and a host of other improved and expanded benefits. No doubt such improvements are in no small measure due to Lane Evans's insistence that veterans be given the fair shake they earned in service to their country.

Lane Evans made his mark on Congress and in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee

right from the start by elevating concern for and promoting action on the issues affecting Vietnam veterans; specifically working to high-light post-traumatic stress disorder, the effects of Agent Orange and other herbicide exposure. He was also an outspoken advocate to address the problem of homelessness and substance abuse among veterans from the Vietnam era.

Congressman Evans led the effort in Congress to increase education benefits in order to keep pace with the rising costs of higher education and restore purchasing power to the Montgomery GI Bill. He also worked to revise, update and improve veterans' employment counseling and job-search assistance systems, and has helped ensure adequate resources to provide dignified final resting places for the Nation's veterans.

Perhaps what best sums up Lane Evans's character, drive and his service here in Congress, are his own words: Speaking on the Floor of the House of Representatives, he said: "Our veterans—those returning from Iraq, those who scaled the cliffs above the beaches of Normandy, those who walked point in the jungles of Vietnam, those who survived the brutality of Korea and other battlefields, all who honorably served or who are now serving, have earned the assurance that VA—their system—will be there when they need it . . . just as we practice on the battlefield that we leave no one behind, we should not slam the door on any veteran who needs the VA system."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. The House of Representatives, the VA Committee and the veterans community will surely miss Lane Evans. We should honor Lane Evans by continuing his work here in Congress to ensure that servicemembers, veterans and military families are treated with respect and receive the benefits they have earned.

I urge all members to support H.R. 521.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I raise today in support of H.R. 521, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building." I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill that honors my good friend and former colleague.

Lane has always served his country with honor. From 1969 to 1971, he served in Vietnam in the U.S. Marine Corps, and as they say, "once a marine, always a marine." When he was elected to Congress in 1982, he immediately worked to make sure veterans were given the benefits that they deserve, and he lent his voice to issues that might otherwise have been ignored. For almost a quarter of a century in Congress, Lane was a champion of America's veterans, and his passion for this cause is truly missed.

Lane and I were able to develop a friendship that transcended politics. We worked together on many issues as members of the House Armed Services Committee. Serving others, especially his constituents, was something Lane did exceedingly well. I was able to see this firsthand when I traveled to his district in 2004. I was impressed, but not surprised, by the enormous number of people who showed up at an event he hosted, which certainly speaks to how well-liked and respected he was, and is, in the 17th district of Illinois. Serving with Lane was truly an amazing and educational experience, and his constituents were fortunate to have such a dedicated pub-

lic servant as their representative in Washington.

Unfortunately, Lane has had to battle Parkinson's Disease since 1995. In his fight against this debilitating disease, he has shown his characteristic courage and perseverance that proved to everyone that he was not going to easily give up. Lane has also been a great partner in the effort to advance stem cell research, which is a matter of tremendous importance to me. While we miss having him fighting with us in Congress, he can be assured that our efforts will continue so that patients with spinal cord injuries, Parkinson's Disease and other conditions will benefit from this research in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to work with Lane Evans in the House of Representatives, and I am proud that today we honor his hard work and inspirational life with this bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, naming a post office building in Rock Island, IL, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building.

For the past 11 years, I have had the great pleasure and high privilege to serve in the Illinois Congressional delegation with a true American hero, Lane Evans. At a young age, he heroically served our country by joining the Marine Corps after high school to fight in the Vietnam War. He has never forgotten his friends and has fought diligently for the rights of veterans. Lane Evans led the charge to compensate Vietnam veterans for diseases linked to Agent Orange exposure, fought to ensure that children of veterans received government benefits and that women veterans had access to the same services as their male counterparts.

A son of a firefighter and a nurse, Lane Evans understood the needs of working families and has been a tireless fighter of protecting American jobs, providing affordable health care for all Americans and increasing the minimum wage. He is a soldier, activist and defender of the underdog and has given a voice to millions of veterans and especially to the good people of the 17th Congressional district of Illinois.

I pay tribute to a man that has well served his constituents and has become a trusted colleague and friend. His work on the House Committee on Veterans Affairs will serve as a blueprint for future legislators. He has shown tremendous political courage over the past 24 years in office and will show even more courage as he continues his battle with Parkinson's Disease.

At this time our Nation demands fearless leaders that stand up for American families and dedicate their lives for the improvement of others. Lane Evans has committed his life to others as a courageous public servant, a man that deserves the title, "The Honorable." I too was drawn to public service, believing that I can help the people of my district and those outside my district. I have not lost that feeling, and I know Lane Evans has not either. We need more leaders in this institution that constantly remember why we are here—to serve the public shoulder to shoulder.

Lane Evans has worked for his district, country and for the freedom of all. His subtle style and modest voice will always reverberate loud in my ears. Congressman Evans, I would like to thank you for your leadership, determination and willingness to fight! Your work in Congress will forever be remembered and your legacy will live on.

Mr. BRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my strong support for H.R. 521, a much-deserved honor for a great American, Congressman Lane Evans.

Although Rock Island, Illinois is not in my district, it is part of the Quad Cities that includes Davenport and Bettendorf, Iowa, which I am privileged to represent.

The entire Quad Cities region has benefited from Congressman Evans' many years of leadership in this body. His passionate advocacy for veterans and working men and women earned him a special place in the hearts of his constituents, and his voice will be sorely missed.

I am proud to serve with his successor, another great champion for veterans and working families, my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman HARE.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 521 as a living testimonial to the many years of public service rendered by Congressman Evans in the United States Marine Corps and in the House of Representatives. Please join me in renaming the United States Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building."

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is enormously fitting that we honor our much-loved colleague by naming a post office after him. Lane Evans epitomizes all that Members of Congress should be: smart, dedicated to the founding principles of our Constitution, a tough-as-nails fighter, a veteran, and a deeply kind man.

He represented Illinois' 17th District with excellence and vigor. Lane took care of his constituents as though they were family . . . and he commanded great respect among those for whom he toiled in Congress.

A former Marine, Lane served with distinction; then served his country in Congress with that same dedication, integrity, and humility. His service experience largely shaped his career and legacy in Congress.

His tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans led to a successful fight for compensation of veterans exposed to Agent Orange early in his Congressional career. As Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Lane expanded benefits for women veterans, pushed for additional medical care for veterans suffering from PTSD, supported veterans' outpatient clinics, and crafted legislation to attend to homeless veterans.

Lane knew the bottom line for his neighbors in Illinois was an economy that rewarded their effort, so he worked hard to promote economic growth and equal access in rural communities. He was a giant on the House Armed Services Committee and brought new jobs to the Rock Island Arsenal.

Understanding both the national security implications and the resource for Illinois farmers, Lane advocated ethanol-producing resources in his district and championed increased development and use of ethanol and biofuels in Illinois.

Not only does Lane inspire all of us who are familiar with his service, but his courageous and brave battle with Parkinson's disease have inspired all of us, plus the millions of Parkinson's sufferers around the nation. Lane is precisely the type of public servant that we all strive to be.

In his work in Congress, in his love and work for the people of the 17th district, and for our nations' veterans, Lane embodied the Marine motto, *Semper Fidelis* ("Always Faithful").

Mr. Speaker, I love Lane like a brother, and I'm proud to support this bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building."

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former colleague, a great American patriot, and a great friend, of Honorable Lane Evans from the State of Illinois, and to voice my support for H.R. 521, designating the Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building."

Lane served his constituents with great distinction in the House for 24 years. During his tenure in this great and honorable body, Lane was a champion of our Nation's veterans. As a veteran myself, having served 20 years in the United States Army, including two tours-of-duty in Vietnam, I feel fortunate that veterans across the Nation had such a strong and stalwart advocate in the United States House of Representatives. His fight to secure assured funding for veterans' health care and better services for our Nation's veterans will always be remembered fondly.

Lane also serves as an inspiration for many in our Nation struggling with a debilitating illness. When Lane was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, he did not shy away from it. He continued his service to his constituents in this great House. Many can look at Lane as an example that life does not have to end when confronted with great uncertainty. One can persevere, and can continue fighting for what one believes in.

I, along with other veterans across our great Nation will never forget the tireless efforts of Lane Evans—a great American patriot, and a tireless advocate for the beliefs he held so dear.

I, along with many in this House, wish Lane nothing but the best for the future.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, the Lane Evans Post Office Bill. By naming this Post Office after our distinguished former colleague, we pay tribute to Lane Evans and recognize his long, distinguished career of public service.

Prior to being elected to the House of Representatives in 1983, Lane Evans served in the Marine Corps at the time of the Vietnam War. His experience in the military and his firsthand knowledge of veterans' issues led Lane to become a leading advocate for veterans during his time in Congress. On issues such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, homelessness among veterans, and the aftereffects of exposure to Agent Orange, Lane Evans consistently took the lead in crafting real policy solutions. Lane's leadership on veterans' issues was formally recognized in 1995, when he was named Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

In addition, Lane always dutifully served his constituents and the state of Illinois. He was a strong advocate for working Americans and was one of the first to see the need for renewable forms of energy such as ethanol.

With Lane Evans' decision to not seek reelection last year, Congress, Illinois, and the nation lost a great public servant. Now, by naming a Post Office after our former colleague, we can say thanks to Lane, and lift up his impressive legacy of service as an example for others to follow.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to show my support for H.R. 521, a bill that would name a post office in

Rock Island, Illinois for former Congressman Lane Evans. This is a fitting honor for a man with such a long and distinguished career.

It was my pleasure to serve with Lane Evans on the House Armed Services Committee. He showed unwavering support for our troops and their families both in his service to that committee and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where he was the Ranking Member. As a Marine and veteran of the Vietnam War, Lane understands the sacrifices made by those in uniform and their families and worked tirelessly in Congress to ensure that those sacrifices would be honored.

I want to thank Lane Evans for his many years of service. We will miss him sorely.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 521.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 49) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, as the "Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 49

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 49, legislation naming a postal facility in Vail, Colorado, after the late Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

President Ford helped ease a Nation during tense times. But even before he was President, he was widely known in this Chamber as a man of great integrity and openness. Although never elected to the office of President or Vice President, President Ford was appointed to mend a bruised American psyche and maneuver our country through the only Presidential resignation ever, to help end the Vietnam War, and to help ease rising inflation.

He succeeded, and for that extraordinary service to his country his legacy should be remembered by all in our country and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of another down payment on thanking President Gerald Ford for his legacy, a legacy that really began, flourished and was all about this body. We are recognizing Gerald Ford as the 38th President of the United States because he did spend 2½ years as our President. But, uniquely, the man born in 1913 in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was, in fact, a man of the House.

During his entire tenure in the House, he did not enjoy time in the majority. Yet his goal was to be Speaker of the House. He had no higher calling, never sought one, but accepted the one that was cast upon him.

At the time that he was selected to be Vice President of the United States, we were already mired in the Vietnam War and disgrace had been brought upon the Vice Presidency. It was Gerald Ford who came in impeccably honest, undeniably a man of the people and a man who was only for the people.

That is how he was selected, that is why he was selected, it is why the Senate and the House thought he was the only man for the job. Who would have known that just a short time, 10 months later in fact, he would find himself cast into an even larger role, another role that he did not ask for.

Yet that was who Gerald Ford was, a man who came out of athletics and out of university to serve in the United States Navy in 1942 because it was the right thing to do. He had represented a district that would have returned him to the House to this very day if, in fact, he were still alive.

Instead, he answered a call, a call that each of us in the House has answered by coming to this body. That was the call of service to the United States.

As I support this naming of this post office in the place he loved, in the place he skied, in the place that he called home for his immediate period after leaving the White House, I do so as the second man of the House that we are recognizing here today, first Congressman Lane Evans and then Congressman/President Gerald Ford.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 49, legislation to name the postal facility in Vail, CO, after our Nation's 39th President, Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

I believe this bill is fitting as another means of honoring the legacy of President Ford, in large part because of his special connection to Colorado and the Vail Valley. I am pleased by the support it has received; all members of the Colorado delegation have co-sponsored the legislation.

In 1968 then-Congressman Ford and wife, Betty, first came to Colorado with their children to celebrate Christmas and to ski in the mountains at Vail. Like many other visitors, President Ford was inspired by the beauty of the area and found a connection to the land and to the surrounding community.

The Fords later owned a home and continued to vacation in Vail. When he became President, his vacations in Colorado helped introduce the world to the Town of Vail, and in fact, the family home was dubbed "the Western White House."

Vail residents knew President Ford and his family as neighbors and friends and are proud of their long association with them. President Ford served on the board of directors of the Vail Valley Foundation. Vail also serves as the home of the Betty Ford Alpine Gardens and the Gerald R. Ford Amphitheater. President Ford was beloved in Vail, where he was known to be a good neighbor, an avid golfer and a lover of the outdoors.

President Ford will rightly be remembered for his personal warmth, his decency, his interest in bridging the many divisions in America during the 1970s. My father, Mo Udall, served in the Congress with Gerald Ford, and while they were often on different sides in political matters—so much so that my father hoped to run against President Ford in the famous election of 1976—they were united by a common view that politics should unite people. They both were firm believers that in public life one could disagree without being disagreeable.

This is a credo I continue to believe in, and I commend the memory of both good men to this House, an institution they loved.

Coloradans, especially those in the Vail Valley, have come to think of him as the first President from Colorado because he was a great ambassador for the State, who established long ties to the people of Colorado.

As a dedicated public servant, President Ford served honorably in his years in Congress and in the White House. Most important, when America needed someone to reassure their trust in government after Watergate, he filled that leadership role with authenticity.

I believe President Ford's special relationship and legacy in Colorado should be appropriately recognized by naming the postal facilities in Vail, CO, in his honor.

I urge all members support the legislation today.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 49.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1445

GALE W. MCGEE POST OFFICE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 335) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GALE W. MCGEE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, shall be known and designated as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gale W. McGee Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 335, a bill naming a postal facility in Laramie, Wyoming, after former Senator Gale W. McGee.

As a three-term Democrat from Wyoming, Senator McGee played an important role in improving the Post Office and securing deserved benefits for Federal workers. He was an expert on foreign policy and helped push our country into its current role as a world power. During his senatorial tenure that stretched from 1958 to 1976, Senator McGee served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Appropriations, Foreign Relations, and Post Office and Civil Service Committees. He went on to be appointed by President Carter as U.S. Ambassador for the Organization of American States, where

he was a strong advocate for the 1978 Panama Canal Treaty. He later started a consulting firm that helped Caribbean and Latin American countries facilitate economic growth.

Prior to his political career, Senator McGee taught high school history and eventually became a professor at the University of Notre Dame. His dedication to service should be remembered by the Congress of the United States.

I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to echo the praise of Senator Gale McGee. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has unfortunately been detained and will not be able to speak on the floor, but she authored this bill because, in fact, he did have a long career of service to this body in the sense of the Congress, and it is appropriate to name this post office after the Senator.

Certainly it is clear that the Congress often names post offices and other bodies after their own Members. But I think today on all three of these bills we picked appropriate candidates, candidates who, in fact, exemplify what this body on both sides of the Dome are about, a body of dedication and service by people who come here to work in a bipartisan way, who come here to make America better, who bring the values of their home State here but who recognize the value of the entire country is what we seek when we come here to meet together to debate and to vote.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 335, a bill I authored to designate a facility of the United States Postal Service located in Laramie, Wyoming, as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office." Gale W. McGee first came to my home State of Wyoming in 1946, to serve as an American History professor at the University of Wyoming. Gale and his wife Lorraine had three of their four children during his time in Laramie. His classes were said to be so popular that the students would "hang from the rafters" to be able to attend. He was a respected member of the community.

That respect was never more evident than 12 years later, in 1958. It was then that Gale McGee began a new chapter in his service to Wyoming, by being elected to the U.S. Senate in his first-ever attempt at public office. His accomplishments didn't stop there. During his entire 18-year tenure in the Senate, McGee served on the Appropriations Committee. In fact, he was the first Freshman in Senate history to be granted this coveted assignment. He also served as Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—a fitting position considering the designation I am asking you to support today. As Committee Chairman, he was widely credited with preventing a nationwide rail strike in 1973, and for spearheading the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. After his Senate career was over, McGee later served as U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States from 1977 to 1981.

As a professor and Senator, Gale McGee dedicated 30 years of his life serving the people of Wyoming. In August of 2006, the Laramie City Council recognized that service by passing a resolution supporting the naming of their local post office after Senator McGee. Due to that local support, I was proud to introduce H.R. 335, and I am even prouder that the entire House will recognize this fine man's service to Wyoming and our Nation when it passes the bill today.

Gale McGee died on April 9th 1992, and his wife Lorraine passed just last March. Through the passage of this bill, we grant not only his family, but the State of Wyoming an official remembrance of our thanks.

I ask for your support of H.R. 335.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 335.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA MEN'S SOCCER TEAM, 2006 NCAA CHAMPIONS

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 70) congratulating the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team, the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Champions, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 70

Whereas the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) Gauchos claimed the 2006 NCAA Championship, 2-1, over the University of California at Los Angeles Bruins at Robert R. Hermann Stadium at Saint Louis University in St. Louis, Missouri, on December 3, 2006;

Whereas the UCSB Gauchos, in their 2006 season, had an overall record of 17-7-1, and a perfect 6-0 mark in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) tournament; Whereas the UCSB Gauchos won a Division I title for the second time ever in school history and first time ever in men's soccer;

Whereas the UCSB Gauchos have reached the NCAA finals twice in the past three years;

Whereas Nick Perera was named the tournament's offensive Most Outstanding Player and Andy Iro was named the defensive Most Outstanding Player; and

Whereas the 2006 NCAA championship soccer team members are Kyle Reynish; Jeff Murphy; David Walker; Andy Iro; Jon Curry; Greg Curry; Bryan Byrne; Paul Kierstead; Tino Nunez; Tyler Rosenlund; Alfonso Motagalvan; Eric Frimpong; Chris Pontius; Nick Perera; Eric Avila; Evan Patterson; Brennan Tennelle; Kyle Kaveny; Andrew Proctor; Bongomin Oti; Bryant Rueckner; Tony Chinakwe; Jason Badger; Jordan Kaplan; Drew Gleason; C.J. Cintas; and Guillermo Jalomo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team, the Gauchos, and Coaches Tim Vom Steeg, Greg Wilson, Erick Foss, and Neil Jones on an out-standing championship season, a season that set the Gauchos among the elite in collegiate soccer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 70 in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team on their 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association championship.

After a tough, hard-fought game, the Gauchos of UC Santa Barbara claimed the 2006 NCAA championship by a score of 2-1.

I would also like to congratulate the UCLA Bruins, the opposing team in the final game, on a well-played season. The Bruins had a season record of 14-6-4 and had three players named to the NCAA All-Tournament team.

Although the UC Santa Barbara men's soccer program appeared in the championship match twice in the last 3 years, this is the school's first men's soccer title and the university's second Division I title in athletics.

They accomplished many successes this year beyond the NCAA championship. The men's soccer team also won the 2006 Big West regular season championship and had a record of 17-7-1. The team was led to victory by head coach Tim Vom Steeg, assistant coach Greg Wilson, assistant coach Neil Jones, and goalkeeper coach Erick Foss. Also assisting the team was the UC Santa Barbara director of athletics, Gary Cunningham.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the student athletes, coaches, and the University of California at Santa Barbara on their 2006 men's soccer team's achievement.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 70. This resolution recognizes the outstanding 2006 record of the University of California at Santa

Barbara men's soccer team as well as their triumph in winning the university's first-ever national title in soccer and only the second in any other sport.

With a 2-1 victory over the University of California at Los Angeles at the 2006 NCAA men's College Cup, the UC Santa Barbara Gauchos ended the season with a 17-7-1 record.

The two rivals, whose schools are separated by less than 100 miles, played hard despite game time temperatures of 24 degrees and a windchill of 11. Still, in a testament to their strength and senior leadership, the Gauchos overcame the weather, as well as a 7-6 mid-season record, to become only the second unseeded team since 2000 to win the national title.

Shortly after the season ended and for the second time in 3 years, UC Santa Barbara head coach Tim Vom Steeg earned the most prestigious honor a Division I coach can receive when he was named national Coach of the Year by the National Soccer Coaches Association of America. According to College Sports Television, "in his eight seasons at the helm of UCSB, Vom Steeg has transformed a program that went 2-17-2 overall in the year prior to his arrival to a Division I power and reigning national champions."

In the first 33 years of the program's existence, Santa Barbara had never reached the NCAA tournament but has now made five straight post-season appearances under Vom Steeg's guidance, including two trips to the College Cup.

I extend my congratulations to head coach Tim Vom Steeg and all the hard-working players, the fans, and to the University of California at Santa Barbara. I am happy to join my good friends and colleagues, Representatives CAPPs and GALLEGLY, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to support this Resolution congratulating the University of California, Santa Barbara men's soccer team for winning the NCAA Division I National Championship.

Along with my colleague ELTON GALLEGLY, I am thrilled to have this opportunity to congratulate every player, coach, alumnus, faculty member and supporter of UCSB.

On December 3, 2006, the UCSB Gauchos captured the National Championship by scoring two goals against the University of California, Los Angeles. This is UCSB's second national title in school history.

While all the gauchos played their hearts out, I'd like to acknowledge two stand-out performances.

Sophomore Nick Perera scored a goal and assisted on Eric Avila's game-winner on his way to earning All-College Cup Most Outstanding Offensive Player of the Tournament honors.

Junior Andy Iro, despite playing through an injury, helped keep UCLA at bay and was named the All-College Cup Most Outstanding Defensive Player.

While the beginning UCSB's season was plagued by inconsistent play, the Gauchos fought to recover, winning 10 of their last 11 games, including 6 straight in the tournament.

Coach Tim Vom Steeg, a UCSB alum, and his staff, Greg Wilson, Neil Jones, and Erick Foss, deserve tremendous praise not only for their impressive leadership in the 2006 season but also for leading the dominating Gauchos to their second NCAA National Championship game in 3 years.

Coach Vom Steeg's colleagues were so impressed with his coaching abilities that they named him the National Soccer Coaches Association of America National Coach of the Year, the most prestigious award that a Division I soccer coach can receive, for the second time.

Mr. Speaker, while the men's soccer team is a great example of the excellence the University produces, there is much more to celebrate.

As many of you know, my husband Walter was a professor of Religious Studies for more than 30 years at UCSB.

Through his experiences as a professor, and my own as a graduate, I have watched the university rightfully gain national attention.

The university currently has five Nobel Laureates on faculty and was recently ranked in the top 15 best public schools in the Nation by U.S. News & World Report.

And with a breathtakingly beautiful campus, it's no wonder that the men's soccer team and the university can attract such notable talent from all over the world.

If any of my colleagues ever find themselves on California's Central Coast, I encourage you to stop by this beautiful campus and see for yourself all that it has to offer.

And of course, don't forget to catch a soccer game at Harder Stadium.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

Go Gauchos.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 70, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 521 and H.R. 335.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR THEIR 2007 ORANGE BOWL VICTORY

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 82) commending the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 82

Whereas on January 2, 2007, the University of Louisville Cardinals football team defeated the Wake Forest Demon Deacons 24-13 at Dolphin Stadium in Miami, Florida, to win the Orange Bowl;

Whereas the Cardinals victory marked the climax of a 12-1 season, which yielded the most wins in the program's history, a Big East Championship, and the school's first Bowl Championship Series victory;

Whereas junior quarterback Brian Brohm was named the most valuable player of the game after completing 24 of 34 passes for 311 yards, and junior wide receiver Harry Douglas tied an Orange Bowl record with 10 catches totaling 165 receiving yards and finished the season with a school record 1,265 receiving yards;

Whereas the Cardinals offensive line provided protection and momentum throughout the season and was a major factor in the team's 457 yards of offense in the Orange Bowl;

Whereas the relentless defense of the Cardinals played a vital role in the Orange Bowl victory;

Whereas the Cardinals defense was led by senior cornerback William Gay, who broke up 2 passes late in the game and extinguished the final hope of the Demon Deacons with an interception;

Whereas the success of the Cardinals is due in no small part to the dedication of Coach Bobby Petrino and his staff, as well as the Cardinals coaches of the last 2 decades, who led a magnificent ascent begun by Coach Howard Schnellenberger;

Whereas Cardinals fans, who stuck with the program through darker times, now have the team they deserve;

Whereas the University of Louisville has achieved a formidable football program, which is consistently among the strongest in college football; and

Whereas the exceptional group of young men who comprised the 2006 Cardinals should be publicly recognized as the greatest football team in the history of the University of Louisville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, Coach Bobby Petrino and his staff, Director of Athletics Tom Jurich, and President James Ramsey at the University of Louisville for the hard work and dedication that led to the Cardinals Orange Bowl victory; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to the director of athletics at the University of Louisville for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 82 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to commemorate the University of Louisiana Cardinals' first BCS victory, and I can hardly believe the words coming out of my mouth.

To say that this moment was unthinkable to the football world 25 years ago is an understatement. After decades of lost games and revenue, the Cardinal football team was on the verge of packing it in for good. Denny Crum had won a national championship and had just taken the basketball team to its third Final Four in 4 years, and for a town and school that had grown accustomed to winning, faith that next year's football team would be different became harder and harder to come by.

But then athletic director Bill Olsen found a believer in the most unlikely of places. Fresh off a national championship and Orange Bowl win of his own, Howard Schnellenberger returned to his old hometown to resurrect the Cardinal football program from the burial ground of college never-had-beens. And he did just that.

In only 10 years at the helm of the University of Louisville, Coach Schnellenberger tripled the number of bowl wins in the school's history and laid the foundation for the program that John L. Smith and Bobby Petrino built into a perennial winner, which this year earned a trip to its ninth straight bowl game.

The ascent of the Cardinal football program emblemizes a ubiquitous spirit at the University of Louisville, not just in athletics but in all programs, in all walks of life.

When the FDA approved the first completely effective cervical cancer vaccine last year, it was two scientists from the University of Louisville, Ben Jensen and Shin-je Ghim, who were credited with the discovery.

At Louisville's Jewish Hospital, U of L faculty performed the first three successful hand transplants in the United States and implanted the world's first successful artificial heart.

And 3-year-old Chase Ford became the first child to regain the ability to walk after a spine injury, thanks to the work of U of L researcher Susan Harkema.

U of L also ranks first among major research universities in National Institutes of Health funding growth and just became the only higher learning institution in Kentucky to promise a debt-free education to students from low-income families through their landmark Cardinal Covenant program.

This spirit of success was exemplified by Orange Bowl MVP Brian Brohm, who never failed to live up to the tremendous hype that followed him to the school. His dedication to his team and his hometown grew all the more evident when he chose to bypass an NFL draft in which many predicted he would be the first player chosen so that he could continue his dream of playing in a Cardinal uniform.

Receiving 10 of Brohm's passes in the final game and tying the Orange Bowl record, Harry Douglas also captured the spirit of Louisville all season long and set the single season record for receiving yards at U of L with 1,265.

These two, along with a committee of skilled runners and receivers and an unmovable offensive line, created an offense that seemed to score at will. Coupled with an impenetrable defense led by Nate Harris, William Gay, Amobi Okoye, and special teams anchored by Art Carmody, the Nation's best kicker, they formed the greatest football team in the history of the University of Louisville.

While the Orange Bowl victory is unprecedented in our community, it epitomizes the dedication, work ethic, and success that we in Louisville have come to expect from our flagship university.

I stand here today to commemorate one win that served as an exclamation of a stellar season, but the victory is far from fleeting. This Orange Bowl and this 12-win season serve as a benchmark of long-term success; and as athletic director Tom Jurich hands the reins to new coach Steve Kragthorpe, there is no one left in the football world who is not confident that he has handed him a winner.

□ 1500

For the players who personified greatness on the field and the coaches who led them, for the program that defied the odds, producing the greatest team in its history, and for the university that consistently acts an example of excellence, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H. Res. 82, commemorating the 2007 Orange Bowl champion, U of L Fighting Cardinals.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 82. This resolution recognizes the 12-1 season of the University of Louisville Cardinals, as well as the come-from-behind 24-13 win over the Wake Forest Demon Deacons at the 2007 Bowl Championship Series in the Orange Bowl.

The Cardinals averaged 39 points a game and ranked second in the Nation in total offense this season, but fell behind 13-10 in the final quarter before their offense went into high gear. Touchdown drives of 81 and 71 yards on consecutive possessions sealed their first win in a major bowl since the 1991 Fiesta Bowl.

The final victory capped a storied season for the Cardinals that included a Big East championship and the school's first-ever win in a Bowl Championship Series game. I extend my congratulations to head coach Bobby Petrino and all of the hardworking players and fans and to the University of Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Representative YARMUTH, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments, and wish all involved continued success. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution and join me in honoring the "Ville on the Hill," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 82, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, in addition to Mr. TANNER of Tennessee, Chairman, appointed on January 11, 2007:

Mrs. TAUSCHER, California, Vice Chairman

Mr. ROSS, Arkansas

Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut

Mr. MEEK, Florida

Mr. SCOTT, Georgia

Ms. BEAN, Illinois

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 521, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 49, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 82, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 521.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 521, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Boustany	Costa
Ackerman	Boyd (FL)	Costello
Aderholt	Boyda (KS)	Courtney
Akin	Braley (IA)	Cramer
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Allen	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Altmire	Ginny	Cubin
Andrews	Buchanan	Cuellar
Arcuri	Burgess	Cummings
Baca	Burton (IN)	Davis (AL)
Bachmann	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Baird	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Baker	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Baldwin	Camp (MI)	Davis, David
Barrett (SC)	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Lincoln
Barrow	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Bartlett (MD)	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Barton (TX)	Capito	DeFazio
Bean	Capps	DeGette
Becerra	Capuano	Delahunt
Berkley	Cardoza	DeLauro
Berman	Carnahan	Dent
Berry	Carney	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggart	Carson	Dicks
Bilbray	Carter	Dingell
Bilirakis	Castle	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Castor	Donnelly
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	Doyle
Blackburn	Clarke	Drake
Blumenauer	Clay	Dreier
Blunt	Cleaver	Duncan
Boehner	Clyburn	Ehlers
Bonner	Coble	Ellison
Bono	Cohen	Ellsworth
Boozman	Cole (OK)	Emanuel
Boren	Conaway	Emerson
Boswell	Conyers	Engel
Boucher	Cooper	Eshoo

Abercrombie	Davis, David	Jindal
Ackerman	Davis, Lincoln	Johnson (GA)
Aderholt	Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)
Akin	Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.
Alexander	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
Allen	DeGette	Jones (NC)
Altmire	Delahunt	Jones (OH)
Andrews	DeLauro	Jordan
Arcuri	Dent	Kagen
Baca	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kanjorski
Bachmann	Dicks	Kaptur
Baird	Dingell	Keller (FL)
Baker	Doggett	Kennedy
Baldwin	Donnelly	Kildee
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Kilpatrick
Barrow	Doyle	Kind
Bartlett (MD)	Drake	King (IA)
Barton (TX)	Dreier	King (NY)
Bean	Duncan	Kingston
Becerra	Ehlers	Kirk
Berkley	Ellison	Klein (FL)
Berman	Ellsworth	Kline (MN)
Berry	Emanuel	Knollenberg
Biggert	Emerson	Kucinich
Billray	Engel	Kuhl (NY)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	LaHood
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Lamborn
Bishop (NY)	Everett	Lampson
Bishop (UT)	Fallin	Langevin
Blackburn	Farr	Lantos
Blumenauer	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Blunt	Feeney	Larson (CT)
Boehner	Ferguson	LaTourette
Bonner	Filner	Lee
Bono	Flake	Levin
Boozman	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Boren	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Boswell	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Boucher	Foxo	Linder
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Boyd (FL)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Boyd (KS)	Frelinghuysen	Loeb sack
Brady (TX)	Galleghy	Lofgren, Zoe
Braleigh (IA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lowey
Brown (SC)	Gerlach	Lucas
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Giffords	Lungren, Daniel E.
Buchanan	Gilchrest	Lynch
Burgess	Gillibrand	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gillmor	McHoney (FL)
Butterfield	Gingrey	Maloney (NY)
Buyer	Gohmert	Manzullo
Calvert	Gonzalez	Marchant
Camp (MI)	Goode	Markey
Campbell (CA)	Goodlatte	Marshall
Cannon	Gordon	Matheson
Cantor	Granger	Matsui
Capito	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)
Capps	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Carnahan	Hare	McCrery
Carney	Harman	McGovern
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Carter	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Castle	Hayes	McIntyre
Castor	Heller (NV)	McKeon
Chabot	Hensarling	McMorris
Chandler	Herger	Rodgers
Clarke	Hersteth	McNerney
Clay	Higgins	McNulty
Cleaver	Hill	Meehan
Clyburn	Hinchoy	Meek (FL)
Coble	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Cohen	Hirono	Melancon
Cole (OK)	Hobson	Mica
Conaway	Hodes	Michaud
Conyers	Hoekstra	Millender
Cooper	Holden	McDonald
Costa	Holt	Miller (FL)
Costello	Honda	Miller (MI)
Courtney	Hooley	Miller (NY)
Cramer	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Hulshof	Miller, George
Crowley	Hunter	Mitchell
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Mollohan
Cuellar	Insee	Moore (KS)
Cummings	Israel	Moore (WI)
Davis (AL)	Issa	Moran (KS)
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Murphy (CT)
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Murphy, Patricia
	Jefferson	

Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns

Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
English (PA)
Graves

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Latham
McCaul (TX)
McDermott
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Ros-Lehtinen

Shays
Simpson
Souder
Tanner
Terry
Towns
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 59 I was unable to vote due to weather and traffic delays. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR THEIR 2007 ORANGE BOWL VICTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 82, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 82, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)

Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)

Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Loftgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns

Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Barton (TX)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
English (PA)
Graves

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Latham
McCaul (TX)
McDermott
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Ros-Lehtinen

Shays
Simpson
Souder
Tanner
Terry
Towns
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1916

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60, I was unable to vote due to weather and traffic delays. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 2007, I was returning from the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland and, therefore, missed three recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on recorded vote number 58, “yea” on recorded vote 59 and “yea” on recorded vote 60.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 58, 59, and 60.

REAUTHORIZE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across America.

Mr. Speaker, 78 percent of the land in Deschutes County, Oregon, is controlled by the Federal Government. It is a recreational and outdoor paradise. Funds from this program have supported public safety, emergency medical, search and rescue operations, and much more to protect the more than 2 million people who come to central Oregon to recreate every year.

County Sheriff Les Stiles says, "Search and rescue is a matter of life and death in central Oregon, and supporting these programs is essential given the surge in outdoor recreation."

Our school kids are hurt, too, because this program has not been reauthorized yet. At the Bend-LaPine School District, administrators face the task of bigger class sizes or fewer teachers as they struggle to meet State and Federal mandates. School Superintendent Doug Nelson says, "These funds help us ensure programs which don't leave kids behind."

Mr. Speaker, Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timber communities. Pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

REAUTHORIZE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I too rise on the issue of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. As my colleague from Oregon just stated, this is a crisis. This is an economic, social and public safety crisis if these funds are not reauthorized. They are now preparing layoff notices for teachers in rural school districts, for deputy sheriffs in search and rescue, for people who maintain our critical road and highway infrastructure in the western and other States across the country.

This Congress must act, and soon, to keep faith with the counties and the school districts where the Federal Gov-

ernment owns a preponderance of the land and has changed forest policies and has dropped their revenues dramatically.

MEMBERS NOT ABOVE THE LAW

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans are fed up with elected officials acting like they are better than everyone else. We have seen scandal after scandal on a bipartisan basis, and people are sick of it.

Just last year, in the face of several inappropriate acts from Members of this Congress, some of our leaders decided that we were above the law. I cannot disagree more. When a local business fails to file its taxes, we investigate. When a parent abuses a child, we investigate. If a Member of Congress abuses his or her position, law enforcement officers must have the authority to follow the evidence regardless of where it may lead.

Listen up America. Last week I introduced H.R. 88 that declares to our constituents that we agree with them: Members of Congress should not be above the law. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

CHANGE POLICY IN IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that all of us want what is best for the men and women on the front lines in Iraq. Certainly it is disturbing when we find that there is a confusion in the reporting of the incident that saw the loss of life of approximately four or five of our soldiers. First, it was represented that they died in a battle fighting against the insurgents and others; later to be determined that they had been kidnapped and shot in the head execution-style.

This, of course, speaks to the failed policy of this administration that our soldiers can declare victory and be returned home, but more importantly it certainly is a shame when we cannot tell parents and loved ones and others how their loved ones fell in battle.

Certainly it is a shame that we find that our young men and women on the front lines may be subject to capture and execution, like being shot in the streets in a most disgraceful manner.

We must fix the broken policies of Iraq. Redeploy our troops, engage our allies in the region, begin a political diplomatic solution, and stop falsifying reports to the American people, not knowing how their loved ones are being executed in the streets of Iraq. I ask for a new policy in Iraq.

PROTESTING IS ACT OF PATRIOTISM

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans came to Washington to protest the war. It was reminiscent of Vietnam, as so much of this war is reminiscent of Vietnam.

What these people did was an act of patriotism and courage, exercising their first amendment rights and expressing their opinion that the policy of this administration and this country is wrong. As they protested, and throughout the weekend, American soldiers lost their lives. It is unfortunate that it seems that the calls of the people are not being heeded.

It is particularly distressing, Mr. Speaker, to hear one of the Cabinet members suggest that people who disagree with the administration are lending aid and solace to the enemy. That is wrong. The first amendment is about free speech. The demonstrations, the protests that happened this week were correct. Samuel Johnson said: "The last refuge to which a scoundrel clings is patriotism." I think we saw people try to find patriotism to be the refuge rather than response to protests and analytical discussions of the policies in Iraq.

FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Father Robert Drinan, a former Member of this House and a champion for the cause of peace and justice, died yesterday.

Father Drinan was a hero and a friend. He recognized early the folly of the Vietnam War, and he fought to end it. He was a critic of the current and senseless war in Iraq. He was outspoken and not faint on issues of human rights here at home and around the world. He was a friend to the poor, a courageous advocate for civil rights and civil liberties, and a well-respected legal scholar. He was also a Jesuit priest who was proud of his vocation and dedicated to the teachings of the Church.

We developed a strong friendship over the years. I certainly sought his advice and counsel on many, many issues; and he never hesitated to provide it. He called regularly, sent me articles and speeches, and always urged me to stand strong for what is right.

Mr. Speaker, our country, and indeed the world, is better off because of Bob Drinan. My condolences go out to his family and friends. He was a remarkable man and a true inspiration and he will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in today's Boston Globe honoring Father Drinan.

[From boston.com, Jan. 29, 2007]

CONGRESSMAN-PRIEST DRINAN DIES

(By Mark Feeney)

The Rev. Robert F. Drinan, who left Boston College's administration to become the first Roman Catholic priest elected to Congress and who in 1973 filed the initial impeachment resolution against President Richard M. Nixon, died yesterday at Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, D.C. He was 86.

The cause of death was pneumonia and congestive heart failure, said a spokeswoman for Georgetown University, where Father Drinan taught legal ethics and other subjects to more than 6,000 students during the past 26 years.

"Father Drinan was a forever gentle, resilient, tenacious advocate for social justice and fundamental decency," said Senator John F. Kerry, who was Father Drinan's campaign manager in 1970. "He lived out in public life the whole cloth of Catholic teachings. In the most divisive days of Vietnam when things were coming apart, this incredible man and most unlikely of candidates showed America how a man of faith could be a man of peace."

A five-term member of the House of Representatives, Father Drinan was one of its most liberal members. His strong anti-administration stands earned him a place on the Nixon "enemies list." His upset victory over U.S. Representative Philip J. Philbin, a 14-term incumbent who was vice chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in the 1970 Democratic primary in Massachusetts Third Congressional District was a high-water mark in the New Politics, which brought the antiwar movement to the ballot box.

Father Drinan's election was also a landmark in U.S. church-state relations.

A Catholic priest, the Rev. Gabriel Richard, had served in Congress in 1822 as a non-voting delegate from Michigan Territory, but he had been appointed. And many Protestant clerics had served as U.S. representatives. Yet the sight of Father Drinan in the halls of Congress in his Roman collar was startling. Some even questioned the propriety of his wearing a cleric's collar and black suit on the floor of the House. Father Drinan had a standard response. "It's the only suit I own," he'd quip.

Before entering politics, the Jesuit priest had long served as dean at Boston College Law School.

Supporters saw his entering Congress as a logical union of his legal and spiritual vocations. "Our father, who art in Congress" became a popular, if unofficial, campaign slogan.

Yet many of Father Drinan's most vehement detractors were Catholics who opposed him politically because they saw his electoral career as detracting from his priestly calling. He further angered some Catholics with his show of independence from the church, supporting federal funding of abortions and opposing constitutional amendments that would have banned abortion and allowed prayer in public schools.

In 1980, Pope John Paul II ordered Father Drinan to either forgo reelection or leave the priesthood. With "regret and pain," Father Drinan announced he would not seek reelection.

"It is just unthinkable," he said of the idea of renouncing the priesthood to stay in office. "I am proud and honored to be a priest and a Jesuit. As a person of faith, I must be-

lieve that there is work for me to do which somehow will be more important than the work I am required to leave."

Father Drinan's unexpected announcement set off a scramble among prospective successors. The winner was U.S. Representative Barney Frank, then a state representative from Beacon Hill.

In announcing that he would not run again, Father Drinan described himself as "a moral architect." It was an apt description of his political career. His election in 1970 was as much crusade as campaign, charged with a moral fervor that would characterize his entire political career. Father Drinan's critics called him "the mad monk." In the context of those highly charged times, it could as easily be considered praise.

"He envisions political power as a moral power," Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate, once said. More advocate than legislator, Father Drinan was an outsider on Capitol Hill. ("You have collegiality much more in the church than you do in Congress," he said in a 1974 Globe interview.) A wag likened his membership on the House Internal Security Committee, the successor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "which Father Drinan wanted to dissolve, to 'an atheist belonging to the World Council of Churches.'"

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Father Drinan gained a national profile in the summer of 1974 when the committee's hearings considering Nixon's impeachment were televised. The hearings would have taken place a year earlier, had Father Drinan had his way. On July 31, 1973, he introduced the first resolution to impeach the president—though not for any high crimes and misdemeanors relating to the Watergate scandal, but rather over the administration's secret bombing campaign in Cambodia.

Father Drinan prided himself on having filed that resolution. But its timing dismayed the House Democratic leadership, which thought it premature and counter-productive.

"Morally, Drinan had a good case," then-House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. noted in his memoirs. "But politically, he damn near blew it. For if Drinan's resolution had come up for a vote at the time he filed it, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated—by something like 400 to 20. After that, with most of the members already on record as having voted once against impeachment, it would have been extremely difficult to get them to change their minds later on."

In 1975, Father Drinan filed an impeachment resolution against U.S. ambassador to Iran Richard Helms for his activities as director of the Central Intelligence Agency. That same year, Father Drinan was chief plaintiff in a suit filed by 21 Democratic congressmen to block U.S. military involvement in Cambodia. It was later dismissed.

Robert Frederick Drinan was born in Boston, the son of James John Drinan and Ann Mary (Flanagan) Drinan. Father Drinan grew up in Hyde Park. He played clarinet with the Boston Civic Symphony and participated on the debating team at Boston College. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1942, after earning his bachelor's degree at Boston College.

Father Drinan did his seminary work at Weston College in Cambridge. (Daniel Berrigan, who would later become a noted peace activist, was a classmate.) He received a master's from Boston College in 1947 and two law degrees from Georgetown University Law Center, the first in 1949 and a master's in law in 1951. Ordained in 1953, he received a doctorate in theology at Rome's Gregorian University.

In 1955, he returned to Boston College as associate dean and professor at its law

school. He became dean a year later, a position he held until 1969. Father Drinan served as Boston College's vice president and provost from 1969 to 1970. During his deanship, the law school went from being "a moribund institution," as a federal judge once described it, to ranking among the nation's more highly regarded law schools.

Father Drinan found himself increasingly involved in public issues. He served as chairman of the advisory committee for Massachusetts of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. As part of an ecumenical group, he went to South Vietnam in 1969 to assess the state of religious and political freedom there.

Asked in a 1970 Globe interview why he was running for Congress, Father Drinan answered with a series of questions. "Why? Why not? Jesuit priests always have been avant-garde. Right?"

His candidacy drew nationwide attention. The conservative columnist William F. Buckley Jr. called Father Drinan "the greatest threat to orderly thought since Eleanor Roosevelt left this vale of tears." He won a three-way race in November by 3,000 votes.

Also elected to Congress in 1970 were such vehemently anti war Democrats as Ron Dellums of California and Bella Abzug of New York. Yet Father Drinan drew particular attention. In January 1974, George H.W. Bush, who was then Republican Party chairman, said there wasn't another congressman whose defeat he more strongly hoped for than Father Drinan's. He promised a major GOP drive to unseat him. None materialized.

Last night, several of Father Drinan's colleagues said his character and conscience made him a strong voice on Capitol Hill. In a statement, Senator Edward Kennedy cited Father Drinan's principled commitment to, among other causes, ending the war in Vietnam. "He was a profile in courage in every sense of the word, and the nation has lost one of the finest persons ever to serve in Congress," Kennedy said.

"When I arrived in Congress, Father Drinan was already serving as the conscience of the House of Representatives with every vote he cast," U.S. Representative Edward Markey of Malden said. "He was a man of faith who never stopped searching for truth, and he was a committed educator who stayed true to his faith."

After leaving Congress, Father Drinan returned to academe, teaching international human rights, legal ethics, and constitutional law at Georgetown University Law Center. He published "Can God and Caesar Coexist? Balancing Religious Freedom and International Law" (2005).

In addition to keeping a heavy schedule of speeches and writing, Father Drinan served on the board of Common Cause, the citizens lobbying group, and spent two terms as president of the liberal organization Americans for Democratic Action. While in Congress, he had been a founder of the National Interreligious Task Force for Soviet Jewry. (Father Drinan was a strong supporter of Soviet Jews seeking emigration.) He also served on the board of Bread for the World, an organization dedicated to feeding the hungry. In a 1992 Globe interview, Father Drinan called ending world hunger his "number one passion."

In that interview, Father Drinan was asked what he felt about the Vatican's forcing him to choose between the clergy and Congress. "History will have to judge whether or not that was a wise decision," he said.

He leaves a sister-in-law, Helen, of Newton Highlands, and three nieces.

Funeral arrangements had not been made last night.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DON'T HURT THE FEELINGS OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about immigration chaos that is occurring in this country.

There has been a lot of talk about immigration, border security and all of the problems that are occurring. But let's talk about one that has maybe slipped through the cracks and we don't hear too much about.

We have people in this country that have come from foreign nations that are illegally in the United States. Some of those people are criminals. They have gone to penitentiaries throughout this country. Our Federal Government then captures those individuals, takes them to an immigration judge. They are ordered deported back to their nations, and here is what happens: eight of those nations refuse to take back lawfully deported aliens. They won't take back their own citizens. Remember, all of these people are illegally in the United States, many are criminals.

How many people are we talking about? Well, we are talking about 136,000 individuals. The cost to the taxpayers to incarcerate those individuals while they are waiting deportation hearings is \$83 million. Who are those nations? Well, seven of the eight, Vietnam, China, India, Ethiopia, Iran, Laos, and Jamaica. They get a permanent get-out-of-jail-free card in the United States because we cannot permanently detain these people in jail after they have been ordered deported and their country of origin refuses to take them.

So what do we do about it? Well, I think that these countries, any nation that refuses to take back lawfully deported individuals, should not receive foreign aid from the United States. But many of these seven or eight that I have mentioned do not receive foreign aid. So why don't we make sure that these people take back their aliens? Well, we already have a law on the books that says under section 243(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, upon notification by Homeland Security that a country is not accepting or unreasonably delays repatriation of their citizens, the Secretary of State must discontinue granting immigrant or nonimmigrant visas to those citizens of that country until Homeland Security informs the Secretary of State the alien has been repatriated.

That sounds good, but the problem is Homeland Security doesn't enforce the

rule of law; and the reason they don't enforce the rule of law, according to a letter we have received from Homeland Security, is that there are other sanctions that they must use because we have foreign policy issues specifically with the Chinese. So apparently Homeland Security is not even notifying our own Secretary of State to deport these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. If a person is supposed to be lawfully deported back to their native country, even China, Homeland Security has the obligation to follow the law and tell the Secretary of State so these people can be shipped back to where they belong.

It is simple, if you come to America illegally, you go home after you are lawfully deported. If your own nation doesn't want you, then you don't get foreign aid, or you don't get any visas for any purpose.

These people that these countries will not take, 136,000, have become our problem because their nations don't even want their own citizens. Our government needs to be more concerned about the rule of law, the cost to the American taxpayer than it is about hurting the feelings of the Chinese on some foreign policy issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, we urge that Homeland Security follow the law and if you are ordered deported and these nations won't take them, then they shouldn't receive any visas to come to this country for any purpose.

And that's just the way it is.

TALIBAN RESURGENCE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to once again discuss the mounting problems and increasing violence by Taliban fighters in Afghanistan and Pakistan. My concern is that the President continues to escalate the wrong war in Iraq while the war in Afghanistan is forgotten. I fear, as do many others, if the United States and NATO do not prioritize Afghanistan, the Taliban will reach a level of strength it has not had since prior to the inception of the United States mission in Afghanistan. This could lead to an impending offensive by the Taliban in Afghanistan which would drastically undermine the United States mission in this war-torn nation.

Over the weekend, the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and other Members of the House leadership visited Afghanistan and Pakistan on a fact-finding mission in order to witness first hand the escalating problems facing those countries.

I was glad to see that the Speaker coupled her trip to Iraq with a visit to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Speaker PELOSI's trip to Afghanistan and Paki-

stan comes as President Bush announces his plan to ask Congress for \$10.6 billion in aid for Afghanistan.

□ 1930

\$8.6 billion of this aid money will go towards training and equipping Afghan security forces, as well as increasing the size of Afghanistan's national army. The remaining \$2 billion will be provided for investment in Afghani infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that he will make a formal request for these funds next month, and I am pleased to see that he is finally realizing that the threat of the Taliban and al Qaeda remains in Afghanistan and that we need to do more.

The ongoing war on terror should focus on Afghanistan and Pakistan, not on Iraq. The United States must be committed to fighting terrorism in those areas in order to protect our country because that is where the war on terrorism and the attacks on our country began.

Earlier this month, Democrats took a significant step toward this goal by passing H.R. 1 which implemented the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. Included in this bill was language that would end U.S. military assistance and arms sales licensing to Pakistan in the 2008 fiscal year unless Pakistani President Musharraf certifies that the Islamabad government is making all possible efforts to end Taliban activities on Pakistani soil.

It seems that President Musharraf is paying the United States lip service by claiming to be supportive of the global war on terror, yet failing to take action against Taliban fighters that have set up training camps in the western region of his country. It is my hope that, coupled with international pressure, the language in H.R. 1 will convince President Musharraf to take immediate action against the Taliban militants in his country.

Mr. Speaker, while the Taliban continues to gain strength in Afghanistan and western Pakistan, it has also been leading an effort to win support of the people of Afghanistan by opening its own schools or madrasas in southern Afghanistan. The intentions of the Taliban are obviously to distract from their regime of terror, not to provide educational opportunities for the children of Afghanistan. Last year alone, the Taliban destroyed 200 schools and killed 20 teachers. It is more likely that the Taliban will use these madrasas not only to trick the people of Afghanistan into believing that they are advocating the expansion of education but also to recruit new Taliban fighters.

This is all part of the al Qaeda's growing propaganda operation. As Sahab, the TV production arm of al Qaeda, last year produced 58 videos, more than tripling its number from 2005, it is clear that the Taliban and al Qaeda are regrouping and working hard to win over the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important for the United States to continue to funnel resources into Afghanistan. We must also ensure that none of our troops in Afghanistan are redeployed to bolster the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. We cannot let ourselves forget where the real war on terror started and continues to this day.

TWO U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS IN FEDERAL PRISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the pages are helping me put up the portrait of an injustice. The picture shows two U.S. Border Agents on January 17, 2007, turning themselves in to United States marshals to begin serving 11 and 12 years respectively in Federal prison.

U.S. Border Agents Ramos, who is at the bottom of this portrait, and Compean, at the top, were convicted last spring for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern border into Texas. These men never should have been prosecuted, yet they are now handcuffed in Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, after months of silence, the President said in a television interview last week that he would take a sober look at the case and a tough look at the facts to see whether the agents should be pardoned. For the agents' sake, I am hopeful that the President will look into this case as soon as possible. The facts will tell the President what countless citizens and Members of Congress already know, that the U.S. Attorney's Office was on the wrong side in this case.

The agents fired shots during a foot chase with the smuggler who had fled in a van they were pursuing. The van contained approximately \$1 million worth of marijuana.

Compelling physical evidence, the angle of the bullet that struck the drug smuggler, makes it clear that the smuggler was pointing something at the agents as he ran away, and the agents fired in self-defense. Yet the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents almost exclusively on the testimony of an admitted drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed.

The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler for his testimony against our Border Agents. This drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas; was permitted to return Mexico; and is now suing the border patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. He is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Since the agents were convicted, three of the 12 jurors have submitted sworn statements that they were misled into believing that there could be no dissent in the jury's decision and

therefore believe that they had to give in to the majority opinion of guilt. Still, the judge refused to overturn the verdict.

Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary details surrounding the prosecution of this case assure that justice has not been served. The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General in this case has outrageously claimed that Agents Ramos and Compean admitted they were out to shoot Mexicans and confessed to knowingly shooting an unarmed suspect. But the Inspector General has failed to make good on his promise to deliver documents to Members of Congress to support these claims.

Nearly 2 years after the conclusion of the agents' trial, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas has answered repeated requests for transcripts of the trial with nothing but excuses.

Mr. Speaker, real justice does not fear the truth. For the sake of the agents and their families and for the sake of the American people who they were working to protect, I encourage the President of the United States to review the facts on this case as soon as possible. The President alone can immediately reverse this injustice by pardoning these two innocent men.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I want to say to the families of Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean that there are Members on both sides of the political aisle in this House of Representatives that will not sit still until the President pardons these two men. They deserve the best of America, not the worst, and God bless America.

PEACE MARCH ON THE MALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this weekend there was an extraordinary event right outside these windows. I come to the floor this evening to celebrate the hundreds of thousands of people who gathered on the Mall this Saturday because they have had enough of this immoral occupation in Iraq.

Groups like Code Pink, United for Peace and Justice, Win Without War, and Peace Action did an exceptional job of organizing the march and rallying their members. We were fortunate to have many celebrity activists in attendance, as well as several Members of the Congress.

But what made the event successful was the energy and the passion in the crowd. It was a testament to the power of the grassroots.

Hundreds of thousands, from the stage as far as the eye could see, packed on the mall, standing together to send a powerful message that Americans want to bring our troops home from Iraq.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to say that 4 years of bloodshed

is enough, that over 3,050 lost American lives is over 3,050 too many for a war we never should have started in the first place.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to register the disgust with the President's Iraq policy, the staggering civilian casualties, the billions upon billions of dollars wasted, human rights abused, our global credibility shattered, terrorists emboldened rather than defeated.

Every objective measure we could possibly use leads to the conclusion that what we are doing in Iraq has been a tragic failure.

And everyone can see that, Mr. Speaker, except the President, the President of the United States, who is asking us to sacrifice more of our tax dollars and more lives and limbs so he can win in Iraq.

You know what they say: The definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results. Fortunately, we have an antidote to this insanity. It is not another Iraq study group. It is not another bipartisan committee to debate and deliberate while more people die. It is not a non-binding resolution.

It is comprehensive legislation that would have all of our troops home safely, out of Iraq, and contractors out of Iraq within 6 months.

It is H.R. 508, the Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, which I introduced with my colleagues, Congresswomen BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS, earlier this month.

But the real authors of this bill, Mr. Speaker, were the hundreds of thousands of people marching on the Mall this Saturday and the millions more Americans who they represent. By offering H.R. 508, we are giving voice to their will.

Many of the marchers came back to Congress today to share their views in person. They want their elected representatives to know how strongly they oppose the continuing occupation and how strongly they support H.R. 508, which would fully fund a safe military withdrawal.

The President has challenged us to issue a plan. We have, and people gathered on the Mall this weekend showed their support. Enough is enough.

In the name of national security, fiscal sanity and common decency, I ask my colleagues, sign on to H.R. 508 and bring our troops home.

GLOBALIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the last half century, it is clear that there has been no greater force for positive economic and political change than globalization. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said globalization.

Greater integration of the world's economies has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in the developing world, nearly doubled the middle class population in Mexico and expanded our economy into a \$13 trillion global leader for greater economic and political freedom.

The benefits of globalization can be seen every single time that a Chinese blogger gets past government censors or a U.S. company trains factory owners in Thailand in worker rights and protections.

So how did the greatest engine of global prosperity become so maligned? How did this poverty fighting, democracy enhancing force get blamed for all of the world's evils, from job losses in Michigan to poor water quality in Guatemala?

In part, Mr. Speaker, this can be explained by the fact that globalization has improved so many aspects of our lives, but it has done so in very subtle ways. As a result, we do not always recognize its benefits.

When you go to the grocery store and find fresh grapes in the dead of winter, you might not know that the fact that they are there and fresh and reasonably priced is that they come from Chile. You just know that you get to enjoy those winter grapes.

When you buy educational software for your second grader, you might not know that it was developed by a small business in Pennsylvania, assembled in Malaysia and serviced by a technical support firm in India. You just know that your daughter is starting to do a better job at reading.

When you buy a new TV because Wal-Mart finally had it at a price you could afford, you might not know that they cut costs by developing and implementing a revolutionary operational structure. You may not know that they source, ship and track goods to and from every corner of the globe by using such innovative practices that they have transformed the entire retail industry. You just know that you get to watch this Sunday in the Super Bowl the Colts and the Bears play away on an amazing screen.

Globalization has impacted us in countless ways, with improvements that range from a better MP3 player to a better job, and together they contribute to a better life.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the improvements to our standard of living often go unnoticed, the challenges that come with change are painfully clear. When a factory closes down, the hardship is very real and very visible. For the individuals who face those tough times, winter grapes and flat-screen TVs seem absolutely meaningless.

□ 1945

When confronted with the difficult challenges change can bring, it is very natural to condemn change itself. But like all hard things in life, it is just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition from China, several

others thrive by utilizing low cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India; and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers here in the United States.

In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation right here at home: over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, including more than 7 million new jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment, as we all know, is at a near historic low of 4½ percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there is no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let us set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few.

Let us ask the question, Can we do that? Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers or the workers who design, market, and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all buy American. Does that mean that we buy Fords that are made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas made in Kentucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism absolutely obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the leading role that we as a country are facing. I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way to join in support of this effort.

But like all hard things in life, it's just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition with China, several others thrive by utilizing low-cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India, and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers. In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation: Over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of NAFTA, including 7 million jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment has dropped to 4.5 percent, a near-historic low.

But while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there's no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let's set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few. Let's ask the question of can we?

Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers, or the workers who design, market and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products, or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all "Buy American." Does that mean we buy Fords, made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas, made in Ken-

tucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods, designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism obsolete. Its impact is wide, pervasive and irreversible. We simply do not have the option anymore of withdrawing from the world and denying ourselves the benefits of a global marketplace.

Our only option is to use the prosperity it has brought to help those who are struggling. It doesn't matter why a job is lost. Whether globalization played a part or not, what matters is that workers have the skills they need to find even better jobs than the ones that were lost. If we make a commitment to American competitiveness, including worker competitiveness, we can both enjoy the benefits and address the challenges of a global economy.

What we can't afford to do is demonize the source of our unparalleled prosperity. There's no question individuals will face hardship at times, and that naturally breeds anxiety. But anti-globalization rhetoric that exploits and preys upon the anxieties of working families is cheap, dirty politics. And it is dangerous. It risks the growing standard of living that the world's economic liberalizers are enjoying. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the politics of isolationism and continue to pursue the path of greater economic integration in the worldwide marketplace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FIREARM TRACING DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks you have heard me talk about gun violence in this country, and I happen to think there are solutions where we can reduce gun violence.

I would like to talk about firearm tracing data. Firearm tracing data gives law enforcement agencies the ability to retrieve useful data on guns used in crimes. Tracing data will let our police departments locate the gun dealers who sell guns used in crimes. Without this tracing data, local law enforcement will not be able to pursue civil action on suppliers that have been implicated in crimes without asking the ATF's permission first.

It is important that we use tracing data to single out the bad gun owners. One percent of gun owners sell 50 percent of the guns used in crime in this country. That is a staggering number. We can crack down on that 1 percent. We can make our streets and cities safer. The collection of tracing data does not prevent anyone from purchasing a gun. It simply gives law enforcement the tools that they need to solve crimes.

As you can see by this chart, 91 percent of Americans believe that tracing data should be used in some form to help crimes, 91 percent. Why aren't we doing a better job on helping our police officers do their job?

Last week, New York Mayor Bloomberg teamed up with Boston Mayor Menino on this very issue. Together they have formed a bipartisan coalition of more than 120 mayors from across the country. The group has many mayors from the urban as well as the rural areas. These mayors understand the need for tracing data. They understand that Congress has done little to help gun violence and stop gun violence in this country.

They are tired of sitting back as their cities lose more and more citizens to gun violence. By the way, they are also tired of seeing the health care costs on those victims that do survive. This is something that we should be dealing with. It is a health care crisis in this country.

Last week, they held their annual conference here in Washington. They spoke with Members from both sides of the aisle. This is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. It is not a pro-gun or anti-gun issue. It is a pro-law enforcement issue with common sense, and it is supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans.

We must do everything in our power to keep guns out of the hands of those that don't deserve to have a gun. That is why I introduced the NICS Improvement Act. This bill will simply strengthen the States. Right now when the NICS system doesn't have the information in it, how can it basically report out who should not be able to buy a gun?

My NICS bill will be giving the States the money to bring their computers up to speed, so that way when someone is adjudicated in court, whether it is on a felony or on domestic violence, someone who should not be able to get a gun shouldn't be able to get approved through the approved NICS system. This is common sense.

Again, this is a pro-safety issue. It doesn't affect anyone who wants to buy a gun, but it makes this country safer from gun violence.

I know it is a very political issue. Everyone is always saying that you are trying to take away my gun. I have never done that. What I am trying to do is save lives; and I am trying to save, certainly, people from being harmed. Our mayors across this great country understand that.

We can do a better job. Congress needs to start listening to the American people. These statistics show that gun owners, by the way, approve overwhelmingly of being able to trace these guns. We should be able to do it. We can do a better job. Americans should have a safer country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERSEVERE AND TRIUMPH OVER OUR FOE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 271 years ago, American patriot and champion of human liberty, Thomas Paine, was born. His pamphlet "Common Sense" is credited with convincing the people of what was then the 13 colonies to declare themselves independent and committed to representative government and human liberty.

Paine was thus instrumental in bringing about the American Revolution. During that historic life and death struggle with Great Britain, which then was the world's mightiest empire, Paine was called upon by George Washington. At a moment when the tide seemed to be against us, General Washington implored Paine to write something that would bolster the spirits of those Americans supporting the patriots' cause.

Yes, there were naysayers and defeatists in those days too, as well as people who were demoralized by the ongoing conflict that was going badly. Yet, had those before us lost faith and given up, the cause of liberty and independence would have been lost. Thomas Paine, at this dark moment of despair, wrote "The American Crisis." It was read aloud to every soldier in Washington's Continental Army, some listening while standing in the snow, freezing, ill equipped and hungry. Yet, they did not give up. They did not give into pessimism. It made all the difference for them and for us.

Every generation of Americans has to bear the weight of responsibility that comes with a commitment made to human liberty by our forefathers and -mothers 200 years ago. When freedom was in the balance and darkness of defeat loomed, Americans persevered and carried the day in the battle against tyranny and injustice, sometimes at horrendous cost, as in our Civil War when we rid America of the sin of slavery. Yes, at times, it looked as if the Union was lost.

Lincoln had the thankless job of leading this country and keeping it unified, he, and the Union soldiers, steadfast and strong. How our world would be different, our country would be different today had they quit and gone home.

In the 20th century, Americans stepped forward to save the world from the evil onslaught of Japanese militarism and Nazism and then communism. There were always low points when pessimism could have taken hold; and had America retreated, it would be a far more sinister world.

So, too, with the current preeminent threat to our security and freedom and the world's, radical Islam has declared war on our way of life. It is an enemy to the liberty those Americans before us so cherished and sacrificed to protect. We are now at a moment when the people of our country are weary of this conflict, especially as it plays itself out in far-off Iraq, where deadly explosions take the lives of Americans, young Americans, as well as Iraqis.

Let us not fool ourselves. The future of freedom and America's role in the world is in the balance. The future will be determined by what we do. Yes, there is reason for despair. The casualty lists include names of young people from Orange County, my Orange County, heroes such as young Marine Lance Corporal Marcus Glimpse of Huntington Beach, whose funeral I attended last April. Also, there is Corporal Angel Jose Garibay of Costa Mesa, and just this past weekend, the funeral of a 23-year-old second lieutenant from Irvine, Mark J. Daily. They now have joined a very selected band of brothers in heaven who gave their lives for America and for the cause of human freedom. Yes, we are proud, but also we feel a profound sadness at their loss.

Perhaps as we decide now, in this moment, when the bloodshed seems so futile, we should remember an earlier time of crisis, when the future seemed bleak, but our own resolve carried the day and the cause with it of human liberty.

I will read the following excerpt from Thomas Paine's "The American Crisis," when he said: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he who stands by it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

I ask my colleagues and the American people to think about these words and to stand firm for the cause of liberty for which our Founding Fathers have sacrificed so much.

We Americans, made up of every race, religion, and ethnic group have a special role to play in this world. We are the hope and light of all those who would live in freedom and long for justice. So as we face the crisis of our generation, perhaps we should again visit the

words of Thomas Paine who inspired those who came before us to persevere and triumph over a formative foe.

HONORING COACH TONY NAPOLET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have given many speeches on the floor of the House, but none do I feel so good about as the one I am about to give about my friend and a great man in Warren, Ohio, Coach Tony Napolet.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the recently completed season and the still ongoing career of someone who is an institution in Ohio high school football in the community of Warren and the family of Warren John F. Kennedy High School. It is Coach Tony Napolet.

Overall, Coach Napolet has garnered three top 10 AP rankings, five State semifinal appearances, a winning percentage of 71.6 percent during his time at Warren John F. Kennedy High School and an overall coaching record of 191 wins, 84 losses and three ties. All of the records, all of the statistics and all of the awards, Mr. Speaker, cannot speak to the influential and inspirational man that is Tony Napolet.

Mr. Speaker, in short, he is a legend. He is funny, he is passionate, he is loyal, he cares about his kids, and he is the best. Tony Napolet is every part of what a high school football coach should be. He realizes and has always realized that the role he plays is not just that of a football coach, but as someone who is preparing young men for the next step in their lives, whether that involves football or not.

I had an opportunity as a young man to coach for a season with Coach Napolet at Kennedy, and you think about how you try to define, Mr. Speaker, or pick a couple of points that really describe Coach Napolet, and there are a couple that I think of. One is his faith in God, something that he is not afraid to share with his players, the students at Kennedy, and it is not just the prayer before the game, and it is not just the mass that we go to before the game.

It is when you go to a mass during the week or in the morning and you see Coach Napolet at one of the many churches, Catholic churches, in the City of Warren, where he is actually practicing what he is preaching. I remember him telling the kids to have a relationship with God, to make God your best friend. It is that kind of an example that he sets for his kids.

But there is another one, the St. Henry's Division V State championship game several months ago, that I think really sticks with these kids. And it is the situations that Coach Napolet is in and how he responds to them, because life many times is about how you respond to situations in your life.

The Kennedy team was, unfortunately, down 21-7. Then they got the

ball, and then they were down 28-7 towards the end of the game and only a few minutes left, and the Kennedy offense got the ball back, and they ran a flea-flicker. They tried to score.

Regardless of how much time was left in the game, Coach Napolet was teaching these kids that you never give up. You persevere, regardless of what the circumstances are. And those are the lessons that he has taught those young men who have graduated from Kennedy and have played football for the Warren John F. Kennedy Eagles.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, I am not honoring a coach and his distinct record but rather a great man who also happens to be a coach.

Coach Napolet, we love you and you really are the best.

□ 2000

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN LAVELLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to someone that lost their life several days ago.

Today, on Staten Island, at St. Peter's Church in St. George, many gathered, family and friends of John Lavelle. He was a State assemblyman from Staten Island and also the Democratic Party leader from Staten Island. His mother, his children and not to mention his colleagues in the State legislature, the Governor, the Attorney General and many members of the City Council, Councilmen Oddo and McMahon; State Senator Andrew Lanza; State Assemblyman Vincent Ignizio; the borough president; and so many others who flocked to the church to honor a good, decent guy.

As I mentioned, he was a leader of the other party; and perhaps, if he had had his way, I wouldn't be here today. But in a way it is a reminder, and John Lavelle to me lived it, that you can disagree and you can feel very passionately about certain things, and, in fact, most often, John and I, we shared the same goals: how to help those who are poor, how to help those who are oppressed.

He was the son of immigrants. The notion that new immigrants to this country make it the great country that it is and they need our help. The fact that he was such a community oriented guy.

Some of the eulogies today emphasized not just his passion, but his son talked about John's grandson and will the community be okay now that his grandfather passed away? He had a beautiful family. Three boys and grandchildren that kept him going and kept him strong.

He was someone who came into office not just for the sake of running. In fact, he spent many years in the private sector and, while in the private

sector, paid his dues. He paid his dues at the soup kitchens. He paid his dues at helping those who were poor and oppressed. Politics was his life and his passion, but it wasn't just about politics. In my opinion, John was truly someone who wanted to help others.

And I will bet you right now there are folks gathered back in Jody's Club Forest on Forest Avenue in Staten Island who are raising a beer to John and his life and his memory, as well they should, because as much as he brought to life a passion for politics, he also brought a passion to be around others and to fight hard during the day. Almost like two lawyers in a courtroom, they are fighting it out on behalf of their clients, but when the courtroom door closed, you could get together for a beer and share and swap a story or tell a joke.

The world needs more folks like him. He was someone who wasn't so caught up on style. He was focused more on substance. Indeed, a straight shooter and someone who, although you may disagree with his policies or his point of view, he knew exactly what he meant and where he was coming from.

So we pay tribute because I know sometimes in life, especially in political life, we have a tendency to get caught up in the toxic environment which is created, but I can tell you in Staten Island folks were able to rise above it. And last week alone, while John laid in the ICU, Democratic- and Republican-elected officials as well as so many family members and friends held vigil in the hospital to hope for a recovery that tragically and sadly did not come.

Staten Island was a better place because of John Lavelle. This country was well served by his service. So tonight I pay heed not as a political official here but as a friend of John Lavelle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I participated in a rally and march here in Washington, DC, on the Mall, organized by United for Peace and Justice. United for Peace and Justice is a coalition of over 1,300 groups from all over this country.

Citizens came from near and far. They came by car and bus and train and plane to urge this President and this Congress to end the war in Iraq. They were young. They were old. They were rich. They were poor. They were

every age, every ethnic group, all religions, all with one message: Bring our troops home now.

There were six Members of Congress who were present there, and we thanked all of the people who attended for caring enough to come to Washington, DC, to spend their money to urge their government to end this war.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this was democracy at work. It was a beautiful day. People were in high spirits. We walked. We sang. We chanted. And we literally said we love this country, we love our soldiers, and we want the best for our people.

We were joined by many veterans. There were several veterans groups there. But the most moving and touching part of this march was the mothers who marched with us, and they had signs. Some of them had signs of their sons who had been killed in Iraq. Some of them brought the message that they had paid a huge sacrifice and they did not wish Americans to continue paying this high price for a war that we should not be in.

This is a war that it is easy to be against, because we were led into this war under false pretenses. There are no weapons of mass destruction. We have been told that we would be greeted with open arms. We were told that we would be seen as the liberators. None of that was true. We are occupiers, and they want us out of Iraq. It is not simply that the Sunnis want us out of Iraq. It is not simply that the Shiites want us out or the Kurds want us out. They all want us out of Iraq.

This was a wonderful weekend because not only did we march and we rallied, but the marchers came to Capitol Hill and they lobbied their legislators. They knocked on their doors. They came from all these towns and hamlets and cities all over America to talk with their legislators. This truly was democracy at work.

And today we filled 1100 Longworth, the Ways and Means room, where we had a forum with 11 book authors who have written about the war in Iraq, what is wrong with it and why we should get out, and did we have a discussion. It was one of the most beautiful discussions with highly intelligent authors who have done research, who have put a lot of work into producing these books. And they shared with us in a very profound way what they knew and why they had decided to take a part of their lives to stop and write about what is wrong with our being in Iraq.

So this was a wonderful weekend. This has been a wonderful time. I keep saying this is democracy at work because this is what the Constitution is all about. It is about participation of the citizens.

The citizens of this country are sick and tired of this war. I don't know why the Members of Congress are allowing the citizens to get way ahead of them. They elect us to come and represent them. They think that we have the re-

sources to know what is going on. We give a lot of money to our intelligence agencies. We should be able to tell the people what is wrong and what is going on in Iraq. But, instead, they are ahead of us; and they are urging us to stop this war.

But, in the final analysis, they know everything about what we are doing. It is not enough to talk the talk. You have got to walk the walk. They know the difference between nuancing and posturing, and they want action.

And they know that we are about to have a resolution over in this House that will disagree with the surge, the escalation that is being advocated by this President. But they also understand that we can't stop that, that the President has already started to resend soldiers. These are not new boots on the ground. These are soldiers that have done their tours, that have been sent back a second and third time, and they say that is not enough.

They will know whether or not we mean business if we are prepared to stop funding this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we come to the House tonight to talk about a variety of things, most of which we will deal with taxes and the impact those taxes have on good, hard-working men and women across this country.

But I did want to respond just a little bit to what the previous speaker bragged about. She went through a long litany of good things that happened this weekend, which I certainly agree with everyone's right to do what they did and to express themselves and to come to this Capitol and make those statements.

She did leave out one minor issue, though, and that is that some of the antiwar protestors brought spray paint with them. And they came to this Capitol, this hallowed ground, the center of liberty for the world, which looks to this Capitol building for that; and those folks brought spray paint, and they painted the walls. They spray painted anarchy signs and anarchy slogans on the walls of this Capitol, which I think defacing public property under any circumstance ought to be wrong. That is wrong.

What else is wrong is the fact that the Capitol Hill Police were told to

allow that conduct to go on. And there were reports in one of the scandal rags today that the police's reaction to that was that they were disgusted. They were livid about the fact that they were forced to allow these anarchists to deface this public property, this building, which all of us serve in. Most of us serve very proudly here.

So not all of the folks who came this weekend conducted themselves the way that they should have, and there was a problem with that. And, hopefully, we will learn what the responsibility of the Democratic leadership was, what their role was in overriding what the Capitol Hill Police's natural and normal reaction would have been. Where did that come from and who told them not to stop that? We hope that we get some answers to those questions over the next coming days, because it is a serious issue when people are allowed to deface this building.

But let us talk about taxes. As our sign shows here, we are 1,433 days away from a staggeringly large tax increase. The first year I think it will be \$250 billion of taxes. In 2011, we will get an immediate bump. The Democrats simply have to do nothing.

In the 109th Congress, Lou Dobbs and others accused us of being a "do-nothing Congress." Well, you can put that label on the coming tax increase, because the Democrats simply have to do nothing over the next 4 years, and that is exactly what is going to happen.

Built into the current law, the current Tax Code has a drop-dead date of December 31, 2010, in which the changes made to the estate tax will expire and the other provisions of the 2001/2003 tax reductions will also expire. So if the Democrats do nothing, then we are 1,433 days away from that major increase. We are only 11 days since the last tax increase by the Democrats. And that was on Thursday a week or so ago where they increased taxes on the oil and gas business in this country, and we have talked about that some as well.

□ 2015

We are going to have several speakers tonight, and the first one that we are going to yield time to is my good colleague, JOHN SULLIVAN from Oklahoma.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Texas for doing this tonight, and also my friend, Congressman SHUSTER from Pennsylvania. This is a very important topic, talking about tax relief for America's working families, for America's small business people.

You know, we have seen a great economy recently. It is roaring along. Unemployment benefits are at an all-time low. You know, gross domestic product is up. We are seeing record numbers in our economy right now. That is due in small part, or in large part, because of the tax relief measures instituted by President Bush.

I do not think, you know, tax relief is the only answer to a robust economy

like we have right now, but it is certainly a piece of that puzzle. You know, other countries have used tax relief as an economic tool to get out of economic slow times. And America has done the same. It has been very important that we have done it.

You mentioned too, Congressman CONAWAY, about the oil and gas tax. You know, oil and gas keeps this economy going. People do not realize, especially people from producing States how vital that is to our economy.

There are so many byproducts from oil and gas. Taxing them is ridiculous. We need to spur domestic production here in the United States and become less reliant on foreign oil, not more reliant upon foreign oil.

Taxing the people that produce that, which is really not only the large oil, Big Oil like the Democrats like to say, but small producers out there, independent producers, small mom and pop independent producers that produce 90 percent of the domestic oil and gas in this country. It is absolutely wrong.

You know, people pay a lot in taxes. We pay too much in taxes. You know, government needs taxes for vital government services like the war, vital infrastructure needs. It is very important that we have taxes for that. But I think that government has gotten too big, and we have taxed too much.

If you think about it, if you look at your Federal tax, State tax, city tax, Congressman, we are taxed a lot. You get up in the morning, you take a shower, the alarm clock wakes you up, if it is an electric alarm clock, you pay taxes on electricity to get you up.

If you take a shower, you pay taxes on the water, soap and shampoo. If you eat breakfast, you pay tax on the cereal you eat. You go to work, if you drive there, you pay the motor fuel tax, tire disposal fee, tag tax.

You go to work, you have income tax or self-employment tax. You go home have dinner, taxed on that. And we are talking, Congressman CONAWAY, you can go home, kiss your wife, you are taxed on that too, that is not free either, you have got a marriage penalty tax too.

So we pay a lot in taxes in this country. And, you know, the people that are counting on these things, if we allow the Democrats to raise taxes like they want to do, and in essence that is what they are doing if they do not continue these vital tax decreases, is they are hurting the American people, they are hurting small business.

Now, 85 percent of the people that work in this economy right now are employed or work or own a small to medium-sized business. And those people, one of the things they talk about is providing health insurance to their employees, and they have been able to do it because of the tax relief, the money that they have saved because of that.

And if their taxes go up, they are not only going to have to probably lay

some people off, but they are not going to be able to provide the kind of health insurance that they want to provide for their employees. They have to make tough decisions right now, and it is wrong.

I remember Congressman SHUSTER and I, we were in the back of the Chamber when we were first elected, and the Democrats were talking about tax cuts. And they said, Bill and I heard them say that some of them were in a group and they said, if we allow people to keep that money, they might not spend it the right way.

Who are they to say that? It is their money. I mean, it is your money; it is not their money. The money that we take from, that we confiscate from taxpayers is not the politicians' money, it is not the Washington, DC people's money. It is the people's money, and they know best what to do with their own money.

And what they are going to do, if you allow a family to keep more of what they earn, they are not going to go bury it in the yard; they can if they want. But they are probably going to go out and buy other things that are taxed. It is going to stimulate the economy. That is what taxes really do. There is a dynamic economic effect of tax relief.

If you allow that money to bounce around the economy several times, it is going to find its way back to Washington anyway. But several people get to touch that dollar before it gets here. It spins around the economy. There is a dynamic economic effect to that. When you take money out of Washington, DC, it helps people, it helps the economy, it bounces around. It is going to find its way back anyway. And tax relief does work.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned a couple of things that I would like to flush out. You mentioned the phrase "Big Oil." It is used as a pejorative, of course. But under the Democrats' H.R. 6 they passed 11 days ago, Big Oil is defined as any C corporation exploring for oil and gas, any C corp. That includes ExxonMobil, all the way down to the smallest C corp, and that is tax phrase, for those out there that might be listening. But it is any C corp that has now got a tax rate that went from 32 to 35 percent, if this H.R. 6 sees the light of day from the Senate, and with the President signing it. So Big Oil includes a lot of folks, hardworking men and women who try to make a living in the oil business.

When I ran for Congress 3 years ago, I ran under the idea that being a CPA, being a business man, that that viewpoint was underrepresented in Congress. I did not have any empirical data to substantiate that, but it seemed to be the case. And once I got here, though, I had discovered that there are an awful lot of our colleagues who really do not understand how hard it is to make money, that finding a product that you can sell to somebody else, and

having bought or built that product for less than what you sell it for, and all of those kinds of things that go into making money is hard to do.

There are an awful lot of our colleagues who simply do not appreciate how hard that really is. So when they talk about tax increases or taking money away from hardworking folks, they do not understand the impact that that has.

One of the other things you mentioned, and you and I share districts where oil and gas are a major piece of the business, is how rugged and resilient and self-reliant these oil and gas guys are. We hit them with a tax increase 11 days ago. One of the things we talked about in the lead up to the debate to try to convince our colleagues on our side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle that this was not really a good idea is this idea that if you reduce the amount of money that is going into increases in domestic production, then you will lower domestic production.

I think everybody agrees on that we ought to be less dependent on foreign oil and foreign natural gas. That phrase rolls off every tongue in this Chamber. The truth of the matter is from where we are today to that point is a decade-long journey. And that decade-long journey is going to be driven with cars and trains and airplanes using fossil fuels.

So to the extent that we can increase domestic production, it seems to me logical that that would reduce the amount of foreign crude that we would have to import. And while it is difficult to exactly understand what the impact will be on those oil and gas C corporations with this tax increase they got 11 days ago, logic will tell you, if you spend less money in the exploration for crude oil and natural gas domestically, you will get less of it. That is just the mechanics. I think that is a pretty easy thing to say.

I appreciate my colleague coming here tonight from Oklahoma, sharing with us his thoughts on tax increases. I would now like to recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania who is actually the moving force behind these weekly hours. It is my pleasure this week to replacing him here in the well, but BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania has got some thoughts.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Texas for taking control of the time. I have got a bad wheel, but I did not want to miss this. I think it is so important.

I want to start off by just echoing your sentiments about what happened here in the capital this week. I mean, a bunch of anarchists, they pushed forward on the Capitol Police, as you said, and the Capitol Hill Police let them come through and deface the United States Capitol.

And I heard that they were saying, that they were chanting it was their

right to. But they have no right to deface the United States Capitol. This belongs to all of the Americans. And nobody has a right to do what they had to. I really want to know, and I hope there is an investigation, there should be an investigation to find out why the Capitol Hill Police did not resist them, and you know the party that is in the majority needs to answer, needs to stand up and be held accountable, because they are in charge, they are the ones that are giving the instructions to the Capitol Hill Police.

I want to know if the majority party said, we do not want you to confront them; let them do whatever they want to do. Because it is outrageous. And all Americans that are watching tonight, I do not know how widely it has been reported. I have heard a few reports. But, you know, it should have made top news that a group of anarchists spray painted their symbols on the Capitol. I heard the report was that there was no incident. Well, there should have been an incident. There should have been an extreme incident of resistance by the Capitol Hill Police to not allow someone to deface what I consider, this is the crown of America, this is the people's House and nobody should ever be allowed to do that. So I am outraged by it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, my sense from being around for a little better than 2 years now is that the reaction that was forced upon the Capitol Hill Police went against their nature. Their nature is to protect, not only to protect you and I and any other law-abiding citizen on these grounds, which is their job, but to protect these grounds as well. So it is inconceivable to me that our Capitol Hill Police, whose natural, normal reaction would be to stand back and let those spray-painters have at it, at the walls of this Capitol building. They had to have gotten some instructions from somewhere. And given the comments reflected in the paper today, that is clearly the case. They were told to stand down and not protect this building as is their nature and their love.

These folks love their job and do a great job at it. And so I agree with my colleague.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, some of them have given their lives up to protect this building and Members of Congress. I agree with you, I cannot imagine that they did not get orders to stand down from the highest level.

Once again, the party in the majority runs this place. They need to be held accountable. They need to stand up and say what they did do, what they did not do. But in the future, if there are going to be, I am certain there will be, as there has been throughout our history, protests throughout the capital, and people have a right, absolutely have a right to protest, but they do not have a right to do it violently; they do not have a right to deface property that belongs to all of the taxpayers. So the questions need to be asked and we

need to have answers from the majority party.

Back again to why, the main reason we are here tonight, is to talk about the 1,433 days from now, if the majority, the Democrats in Congress, do not act over the next 4 years, or 1,433 days, we are going to see an over-\$200 billion tax increase on Americans, on the American family, on small businesses.

And that is going to significantly hurt this economy. And you just have to look at the facts. Over the last 4 years, 7.2 million jobs were created in this country because of those tax cuts. Just in December, 167,000 jobs were created. The unemployment rate at 4.5 percent, the lowest average it has been in five decades.

If we do not extend them, if we do not do what is responsible, then money, real dollars are going to come out of the American people's pocket. A family of four, making in the \$40,000 range, they are going to see a tax increase of about \$2,000.

Now, to some in this body, \$2,000 may not seem like a lot of money, but it is to a hardworking American family. \$2,000 is a nice down payment on a new car, \$2,000 will buy you a new washer and a dryer. \$2,000 helps you put your son or daughter or yourself through college or to get educated or trained on something.

So I hope that the American people that are watching tonight, whether you are Republican, you are a Democrat, there are lessons for us all through history, recent history, on why tax cuts work, why they are a good thing for the economy, why Americans should be allowed to keep their hard-earned dollars. You have to go back to the 1960s.

President Kennedy, he cut taxes. What did he see? The economy came on strong. Revenues to the Federal Government increased dramatically. We saw that in 1980. And today we are seeing it at record levels. As the gentleman from Oklahoma pointed out, there are a lot of things in this economy that are happening because of those tax cuts, and we need to make sure that they continue.

It is startling to me. Although, I watched and was obviously very keenly aware of what the Democrats were saying during the last campaign. And the first thing that they basically said, when you listen to the incoming chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, he basically told the American people that he did not see one of those tax cuts that really had merit and that everything was on the table. So the American people should not be surprised when they see these tax cuts.

And just 11 days ago was the first Democratic tax increase. They changed the rules of the House to make it a simple majority. When we put it in place as the majority party, it had to be three-fifths of votes to increase taxes. They made it a simple majority, because they knew how difficult it is going to be to get a majority in this House to raise taxes on the American people.

□ 2030

So, once again, if we don't stand up and fight, and I hope my Democratic colleagues who aren't here tonight, the Blue Dogs who come down and talk about fiscal responsibilities, if they don't join with us to fight these tax cuts, they are going to take part in this huge tax increase that is going to occur on the American people. So I appreciate the gentleman tonight hosting this hour.

Mr. CONAWAY. Let me make a comment if I could on something that you had said. You talked about what hardworking Americans do with the money that they earn and keep; and you went through a litany of things that they buy, washers and dryers, cars and all these kinds of stuff. If you think about it, though, everything that they bought is made by somebody; and that person made a living making whatever it is they made.

Then there is also a good string of, for lack of a better phrase, middlemen in between that product being made and it being sold to the American consumer, which is the ultimate driver of this economy. You have got truck drivers and warehousemen and storage handlers and retailers and a long list of people who take that finished product from wherever it is made, even if it is made overseas, from wherever it is made, and they get it all the way to that retailer's shelf, where an American consumer takes that money that he or she earned themselves and they go buy that product.

That starts the cycle all over again that has built a growing economy that is now in its fourth year of growth; and if you look at the CBO estimates that the Budget Committee will talk about tomorrow, that growth is expected to continue over the next 10 years.

Now, 10 years is about as far as we project anything. And like I said, I am a CPA, and I have been dealing with projections for a long time. Quite frankly, years 5 on through 10 are just mathematical exercises. I mean, who knows whether or not those are going to be correct or not? The 2007 estimate is pretty good. The 2008 estimate is pretty good. But, beyond that, it gets a little fuzzy as to the accuracy of those projections. But, nonetheless, those projections show an improving economy.

Not only that, but the Federal Reserve as well shows an improving economy; and that is because people are out buying things, furnishing homes, buying cars, all the kinds of things the American consumer does to continue to drive this economy.

The Federal Government, the best thing we can do is get out of the way. And one of the best things we can get out of the way of are tax increases, and there is a big one coming.

You know there is a phrase out there, if a violent jihadist threatens your life, you probably ought to take him serious. Well, I think the same thing applies to tax increases. If somebody

threatens you with a tax increase, then I think you ought to take them serious. And we are 1,433 days away from a significant tax increase.

I now want to go to my good colleague from Kentucky. GEOFF and I are in the same class. The 109th Congress was our first time here. And Geoff has got a big family, which in and of itself contributes to the economy, we appreciate that, of your part of Kentucky as well the rest of the United States. So, GEOFF, share with us tonight what your thoughts are on taxes and the American people working.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Just as a former small business owner, one of the things that I would like to point out, that 88 percent of new job opportunities are created by small business owners. They are created by land developers, by construction companies, by small machining and tooling companies, small fabrication businesses, distribution businesses, professional services businesses, financial services. The glue that holds the institutions in our communities together, the framework of members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, of our local Chambers of Commerce that serve that valuable function of communicating an agenda that focuses on growth, that strengthens our Nation for the long run.

And I think that one of the things that I would like to highlight tonight, again, is this theme that when people voted in November, much perception nationally was focused on a view that national security situation was driven by emotion. But the reality is that in that election, short of making significant strategic changes in the leadership of this Congress, America voted to increase taxes on every working family in America by at least \$2,000 a year.

One of the things that I have told folks for many, many years is we don't need to raise taxes. We need to create taxpayers. Government does not create jobs, and government itself does not create wealth or a nest egg for families of America to build for the future. What government can do, however, is set a framework for achievement, a framework where people can pursue opportunity.

The Constitution tells that the government is to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare. What are some of the ways that we can promote that general welfare? One of the key ways to promote the general welfare is to allow people to keep more of what they earn because they will invest it in a way that focuses on the needs of their family. They will invest it in immediate needs, in consumer goods that have a ripple effect of creating jobs. They will invest in future and retirement plans for themselves and set aside money to grow for college. All of this is fueling the economy, and keeping this in the private sector is very critical.

Some of the things that the tax cuts did were allow people to keep more of

what they earn. We eliminated the marriage penalty. We increased the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000. That meant, in the case of my family, nearly \$3,000 that was left to reinvest in the lives of our children and their education to save for their future. It makes a very, very big difference. When we look at the marriage penalty, it put a significant impact on working families. And, again, I come back to the fact that the average family in America is facing a \$2,000 per year income tax increase.

But there is another side of this from a small business standpoint of job creation. I would like to highlight one man whose small business benefited in the manufacturing world, creating jobs in his community, impacted the local economy because of pro-growth policies that were continued in the last Congress, allowing not only individuals and families but also small business owners to keep more of what they earn, to be able to invest that, to write down debt and to prepare to compete in the future.

We are a global economy. It is critical for us to be able to allow people to invest for the future. Remember, we don't need to raise taxes. We need to create taxpayers.

Robert Prybutok of Newark, Delaware, owns a company called Polymer Technologies. Because of the tax cuts that were enacted, he was able to hire 10 new employees in 2003 and 2004. He had approximately 72 employees in January of 2003 and now has about 90 employees.

His business continues to grow and with it the need to buy new equipment. By utilizing the expensing provisions of the tax cuts, he was able to purchase two new pieces of equipment, increase his productivity, thus increasing the security of those jobs of his company; and it saved him about \$125,000 that would have been lost in cost. This is money that can be invested in the future.

Without the ability to expense his equipment, he would have been hard pressed to purchase that equipment in the first place. He needed to grow his business and pay the taxes that he owed.

And I think the one thing that I keep in mind from my experience walking the shop floors of many, many businesses during the era of the Clinton administration where these breaks were not in place for America's manufacturing companies. People made decisions based on the structured Tax Code. They withheld making needed investment in competitive productivity improvements, needed investments in the professional education of their employees because they were uncertain of what the future held. Had the tax expensing provisions been in place, they could have made those investments more easily.

And I think it is important to keep in mind that it allows a business to invest in the future to create more tax-

payers. I think that this ability to expense equipment, this ability to make investments that are going to be job-creating investments, maybe a short-term deferral of tax payments to the Federal Government, actually will increase revenues.

How have we seen that? We have seen it over and over again. As taxes are cut, more money goes into the investment economy, more jobs are created, more taxpayers are created, and tax revenues are an all-time high right now in the Federal Government.

I think there are countless stories that we can share of successes on a small scale in small business which is really the opportunity to live the American dream. The vast majority of jobs in this country, nearly 90 percent, 88 percent are created by small business owners. They are not created by large corporations.

There is so much of a focus on the class warfare rhetoric that goes on in the Chamber that misses the point where the majority of the Americans work. And the majority of Americans work in small business. That is why we need to reduce the burden on those small businesses, create incentives so they can create jobs and create taxpayers to promote the future for their employees.

With that, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Texas to share more of his perspective on this matter.

Mr. CONAWAY. I appreciate my colleague from Kentucky joining us tonight to have this conversation among the several of us.

I served on the Chamber of Commerce board in Midland for a number of years, and one of the things that the chamber looks at is the impact that payroll has on a community. There is a difference of opinion among folks on the chambers as to what this number ought to be, but there is a guess as to how many times that payroll turns over in a community. In other words, when the payroll is made, it is spent on local goods and services, and that person then turns around and spends it on local goods and services, and the range is, for most economic development guys, is between four times to seven times. Depending on the number you want to brag on, it will be somewhere in that range.

So the payroll that gets created that my colleague from Kentucky was talking about a while ago where these small businesses add employees turns over several times within the community and creates additional jobs, additional opportunities and additional prosperity for those folks.

It is interesting, I had a conversation this afternoon with my staff, and we are all anxiously awaiting the continuing resolution from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Chairman OBEY of the Appropriations Committee posted on his Web site this afternoon that they did in fact file the continuing resolution. And my staff called, and we went to the Web site. They said it was

filed. And me and my staff did. Of course, nothing is there.

So my staff called over there and asked and they got kind of a run-around. So I said, well, I will just call. So I called, and I said, hi, this is Congressman MIKE CONAWAY, and I would like to see a copy of the continuing resolution that has been filed.

And the lady said, well, it has not been filed.

I said, well, I am looking at a Web site for the Appropriations Committee, and it says they have filed.

She said, well, I know. I am not sure why that is up there, but.

I said, well, am I getting the run-around here? Is it really up there or not?

She said, no, that is a mistake. It hasn't been filed.

So, anyway, we are all awaiting the continuing resolution.

In the meantime, we are all trying to guess at what might happen. And over at the Social Security Administration they are concerned about furloughing employees because the continuing resolution that they thought might be in place will fund them at lower levels than they have been expecting and so that they are going to have to lay off employees.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield on that point for a moment?

Not only does it affect employees in the Social Security Administration who process checks for our senior citizens, it also affects our ability to fight against Islamic radicalism, fight against terrorist groups.

I flew in today with members of the FBI Southern Ohio office out of Cincinnati coming in for some business here in Washington, and they shared their concern over the lack of a continuing resolution. Was the money going to be there to fund their operations? And, right now, one of the things that our national security apparatus, because of this Democratic Congress, is having to cut positions, not just a few positions but nearly 3,000 positions because of the lack of funds to do their job which we had provided for them.

When we talk about the issues related to bringing this continuing resolution, there was a clear statement that was made about the desire to work harder. Well, last week, 2 days, we were done by 2 p.m. This week, I am reading the schedule, and it says, tomorrow, Tuesday, we will be out around 2 p.m. Wednesday, no rule yet on the continuing resolution, but likely we will be out at 2 p.m.

I don't know how many nights we worked long, long hours in this Chamber, long, long hours in committee to get the people's work done. And now we have Federal law enforcement.

I got a call today from an aviation unit in the Army that is now very concerned about its receipt of dollars. And we are inside the 48-hour window, have no language on what this bill is. They

are limiting debate to 2 hours, which I think is a very powerful statement of the direction in which they choose to take legislation, that not only did we have a tax increase 11 days ago but spending is going to be without accountability.

I intend to vote against this resolution if this resolution will not disclose the information that is necessary for us to do our job. Because, ultimately, they are going to create some real problems leading up to the foundation for this tax increase in 1,433 days.

Mr. CONAWAY. And my good colleague has added to the list of folks that are going to be impacted by this reduced cash flow to these agencies. Think about that for a second. That is what we are talking about, over at the Social Security Administration, at the FBI and other places that GEOFF has talked about. It simply reduced cash flow to those agencies; and, because there is a reduction in cash flow, they are reducing mission, they are laying people off, they are doing less service. The Social Security folks won't have as many people to service all those callers out there.

That is exactly what happens in small businesses when we reduce their cash flow by tax increases. Because money that would otherwise go into making payrolls and paying benefits and adding folks to the payrolls is now coming into these Federal Government's coffers being spent in ways that, for the most part, I suspect they are good, but there is an awful lot of waste in there. And, clearly, our taxpayers out there can spend their own dollars better than we can on their behalf.

□ 2045

Now, subsequent to my conversation with my staffer, we have gotten a rumor. And again in the minority we get to whine all the time. It is just going to be our job over the next 2 years, just to be very good whiners. It is not in our nature, it is very unlike us to do it, so we will probably do it very poorly. But we don't know what is going on over there. It has been days and days and days. These folks knew they had the reins of this thing starting January 4; they knew that on November 8. And we have had now over 2 months that they knew that this was going to be the circumstance, that they were going to be dealing with the continuing resolution, and we have no resolution to the continuing resolution. And I am sure there are good reasons on their side of the aisle for why they have not been able to make these decisions, but surely these decisions are not going to involve some of the draconian nonsense that many of our agencies are worried about, and they are worried about it because they don't have the facts. Most folks deal real well with facts. What we don't deal well with is uncertainty, innuendoes, and rumors.

So I would encourage our folks on the other side of the aisle to get that

CR done if you are going to do it. If not, then let's start bringing appropriations bills to the floor. There is nothing wrong with that. That is a nice way to do it. We should be legitimately criticized because we didn't get it done under our watch, but that same criticism now applies to the folks in charge. It doesn't matter, just get on or off the pot, as they say. Bring a CR to the floor, show us what it is; if you are hiding stuff, give us a second to try to find that out. Or let's go at it from the appropriations standpoint and bring those to the floor one at a time, as we should have.

Mr. SHUSTER. Would the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. CONAWAY. Sure.

Mr. SHUSTER. I don't know if this is accurate or not, but I have heard people talking that the CR is going to come to the floor and it is going to look like an omnibus bill. And you know, an omnibus is like a Christmas tree; they hang everything on it that they want to get through. But that is the rumors that are swirling around here, that it is not just going to be just a CR, it is going to be an omnibus. And that is going to be bad for spending, and they are not living up to their word.

Mr. CONAWAY. I have also heard they are going to wipe out all the earmarks. It will be their definition of an earmark, and it will be interesting to see which earmarks really get zeroed out and which ones don't and how they parse that definition between the two in order to keep the ones they want and peel out the ones that they think are wasteful spending, and it will be interesting where those earmarks impact and which districts are the ones that really get peeled out.

Mr. SHUSTER. Kind of like their definition of openness.

Mr. CONAWAY. Exactly. And transparency.

Mr. SHUSTER. Openness and participatory, and transparency. And here we have passed several bills, and having gone through the committee nobody has seen them until they show up on the floor.

Mr. CONAWAY. It is not likely that this continuing resolution will go through committee either. It is just going to get dropped on us like a laser-guided bomb, rushed straight to the floor, not going to go through committee, not going to have the openness and the transparency and the 48 hours and all the kinds of things that our good colleagues on the other side of the aisle promised in October.

Promises in October are hard to keep in January, and we are seeing it, and we will continue to try to point that out without seeming as whiny as it sounds, I suspect, to my colleagues and my constituents in west Texas. But that is going to be part of our role over the next 2 years, is to be the loyal opposition, to try to do so in a respectful manner as we point out promises made and promises broken by folks on the other side of the aisle.

Does my colleague from Kentucky have some other thoughts?

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. One of the things that I would like to share as we come back to this issue of tax policy, again, I come back to my time walking the shop floor, and for me the one thing, you hear a lot of stories and a lot of perspectives, but for me it always came back to show me the numbers. Let's take a look at the truth, what reality is, and be able to make our decisions from there. Here is the truth about the impact on creating jobs for working families, good jobs, jobs where there would be opportunities for health care, to fund their children's education, looking to the future.

In less than 3 years, because of this policy of allowing people and allowing and incentivizing small businesses to keep more of what they have earned, the U.S. economy has grown by \$2.2 trillion. Let's put that in perspective for a moment. That is larger than the entire Chinese economy. That is the growth of the United States.

There is a lot of concern about international trade in this global economy. Just in 3 years, our increase in economic growth is bigger than the size of the entire economy of our largest international competitor. It is much larger than the total economic size of India, Mexico, Ireland, and Belgium. And I think the issue here at the end of the day is being able to allow people to keep more of what they earned, to create taxpayers, not raise taxes, because the proof is in the numbers. The proof is in changing opportunities. Yes, we are going through a time of economic adjustment, but at the same time record job creation as our economy adapts to the 21st century to compete effectively, and that is the future that our kids are going to have.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank you.

Let's go to another colleague of ours from Georgia. Dr. PHIL GINGREY is an OB/GYN doctor, a provider of professional services for most of his career. And while all of us have great respect for physicians, at their core they run small businesses and maybe big businesses. But at its core the practice of medicine has to be a business, because he and his colleagues have to make money, they have to be able to pay their payrolls, they have to be able to buy the supplies for their offices, and all of those employees and provide benefits and all the things that they do. So in addition to providing I suspect outstanding professional care over a long, long period of time, and maybe he will share with us the number of babies he helped deliver, he is also a businessman. And in my book, that is a good two hats that he has worn over these years. So let's hear tonight from Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding, and I am proud to be here tonight with the Countdown Crew to talk about an issue which typically you would think or you hear said many times that our

physician colleagues across this country are not real good business men and women. But as my colleague, the CPA from Texas, just pointed out, they better darn well become good business men and women.

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman would yield for a second. I suspect that comment is made about their other business decisions. Running their practices, they are great business persons; but maybe in the oil business, they may not be as good.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the carve-out, but it probably specifically applies to the gentleman, the peach from Georgia.

But in any regard, the main point that I would like to make, and maybe my colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky and my good friend from the Keystone State Mr. SHUSTER from Pennsylvania, have already mentioned this, but if Congress takes no action, and that is what the Countdown Crew is talking about in these 1,433 days leading up to January 1, I think, 2011. But in 2007, in fact I think this has already occurred, but we can do something about it because tax day, April 15, is, thank goodness, 3 months away. But taxpayers in States with no income tax will not be allowed to deduct their sales taxes from Federal income tax if we don't make a change. And we are talking about Representative CONAWAY's great State of Texas, a highly populated State. We are talking about the great State of Florida. We are talking about Tennessee and other States. And this is significant, because citizens in those States pay no income tax, no State income tax, but pay huge sales tax to fund their State government, and that will go away if we don't do something about it.

In 2007, I think the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned this, the exemption for the alternative minimum tax will decrease from the current \$42,500 to \$33,750 for a single filer, and from \$62,500 to \$45,000 for a married couple.

In 2009, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the standard deduction for couples as a percentage of the standard deduction for a single individual decreases from 200 percent to 174 percent, further discouraging couples from entering into the great sacrament of matrimony.

And in 2010, the section 179, Small Business Expensing Cap, will decrease from \$100,000 to \$25,000.

I heard my colleague from Kentucky, Representative DAVIS, talk about this just a minute ago; and he made the comment that most of the jobs in this country, and that would include those 7 million new jobs that have occurred since 2003, in fact more new jobs than the European Union and Japan combined, most of those 7 million new jobs are created by small business men and women. And this section 179 which allows them to write off \$100,000 in the first year for capital improvement, buying a new piece of equipment, indeed, expanding the size of their operation so they can hire new people, if it

goes down to \$25,000, you are going to see, just like a stand-alone increase in the minimum wage, you are going to see jobs lost, and all of a sudden that 7 million number is going to start trickling down.

It has been mentioned that the child tax credit will decrease from \$1,000 to \$500.

And listen to this, my colleagues: on marginal rates, if this has not already been mentioned, and even if it has, it probably deserves repeating, the 35 percent bracket will increase to 39.6 percent; the 33 percent bracket, 36 percent; 28 percent bracket, 31 percent; 25 percent, up to 28 percent; and, worst of all is the 10 percent bracket will increase to 15 percent. And not to mention capital gains going back up to 20 percent. Dividends, again, double taxation on dividend. All of these things are going to really hurt this economy.

And while maybe under our majority leadership there are a lot of areas in which we could have done better, I truly believe, and I think my colleagues here tonight would agree, we could hardly have done better than the 2001 and 2003 tax cut package, many of which I just enumerated, including finally trying to get rid of the double taxation of the death tax, the estate tax. This is what Republicans have done. This is what this President has done. And this has resulted in 7 million new jobs.

Instead of an estimated cost to the revenue of \$1.3 trillion over 10 years because you made these cuts, guess what: within 2 years we have run the revenue, I think, and my colleague from Texas knows these numbers better than I do, but something like \$275 billion more revenue because of the tax cuts.

I have said this a number of times on this floor, and maybe the folks at home watching on C-SPAN know this, but in 1960 Democratic President Kennedy cut taxes, revenue went up drastically; in 1980, President Reagan, Republican President, did the same thing and the revenue went up. And of course that is the case that we have here today.

Unemployment rate across the country, 4.6 percent. In my State, where we have actually, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we have actually lost a lot of jobs here recently because both General Motors and Ford have shut down plants that have been in Georgia for a long time, but our unemployment rate is just barely above 5.1 percent, and we are growing jobs in other areas, small businesses primarily as I said earlier.

So to be here tonight to talk about this, talk with the Countdown Crew why this is so critical, because we know the Democratic majority has already said it. But this issue of PAYGO that they have put in the rules package, it is an absolute farce. It doesn't even look like the PAYGO provision that the then-ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT from South Carolina, that what he proposed was that there would be no point of order waiver allowed; and yet in this

new rules package that they proffered in the first week of the 110th, they allow that. So that at any point if PAYGO is violated, then they can simply in their Rules Committee waive that point of order. Or if they don't want to appear hypocritical and they don't waive the point of order, then whatever is done on the Senate side and comes back as a conference committee, they waive all points of order. So to have a really meaningful PAYGO provision, then it needs to have the force of law.

And I will conclude by pointing out the double standard here. What the Democrats would consider a tax cut and the expiration of these tax cuts as something that has to be offset, but they would not consider the extension of a program that expires, that has a sunset. Let's say as an example, and I think this is a great program and I hope we continue it and maybe even make it better, but as an example of the hypocrisy of PAYGO, take something like the SCHIP program which was authorized 10 years ago and we spend about \$5 billion a year on that program. It is scheduled to sunset in June, I think, of 2007, this year. And I am sure it will be reauthorized, but that additional spending will be outside of PAYGO rules.

But yet when we have these tax cuts that expire, if we, the Republican minority now, want to continue those great tax cuts for the reasons that the Countdown Crew has enumerated here tonight, then that would be considered a new tax cut and would have to be offset. It is so hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues. I think it needs to be said over and over again, and I want to come become and join my colleagues as often as we can to talk about this, because American people need to understand.

With that, I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague.

Let me make three points really quick and then we will go to closing comments because we have about 12 minutes left. But you mentioned the sales tax deduction. Just to help our many colleagues that have joined us tonight to listen to this great debate in the Chamber with us, let me explain to them what the impact is.

It is a matter of equity, because States that have income taxes, those income taxes that you pay in the State reduce your for Federal tax purposes. So you get to deduct those State income taxes.

□ 2100

So you get to deduct those State income taxes. States without an income tax, unless we put this provision back in, those taxpayers in effect subsidize the rest of the United States' taxpayers because there are inequitable circumstances. So being able to deduct sales taxes means that the taxpayers in Texas are on a more equal footing with

taxpayers in States that have an income tax.

You mentioned the marriage penalty being a detriment to getting married. I don't know if that is the case. I do know there is a calculable tax toll for making the decision to get married. That may not dissuade couples from getting married, but it might. There is a tax toll, and all of us agree that strong families are the core of the institution that is America. And to the extent we discourage strong families, shame on us.

Finally on the 179, by dropping that deduction from \$100,000 to \$25,000, what happens there is the only businesses that pay money are businesses making money. You have to have taxable income in order to make money. If we have reduced the deduction by \$75,000, the company has to pay tax, and let's assume a 35 percent tax rate, on that \$75,000. So you take the \$75,000 in profit, less the \$26,500 that you pay in taxes and that net, \$48,000, is all they have got left to pay dividends or reinvest in their business as opposed to the \$26,250 that they could have reinvested in the equipment. So these are meaningful hits and meaningful tax policy that we ought to continue.

I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. When you talk about creating strong families, I comment on our good friends and neighbors back in Kentucky, Mike and Vonna Drake. They typify Americans living that dream of being able to pursue their own opportunity. Mike works as a pilot; Vonna is a nurse. Their children are friends with my family. I have watched their kids grow up through the years.

These policies that seem so arcane, reading about them in the news or some of the shrill rhetoric that we hear during political campaigns, have a real impact on their flexibility and ability to invest in their children's future, let alone decisions that they might make regarding their futures and careers.

In 1,443 days, my neighbors are going to have a \$2,000 tax increase. They have two children. The \$500 per child tax credit that was increased to \$1,000, recognizing the cost of raising a family, the cost of investment in all of the needs of our children, and not simply food and clothing, but education and activities to grow them and develop character and to strengthen them for the future. That will revert by \$500 per child.

Now they will have an additional \$1,000 just on that alone. Because they are married, they attend church, they are committed to their faith, they are a great example of a family in our neighborhood and community, just based on the fact that they chose the course to get married, their taxes are going to be increased or they are going to have a tax penalty of 12 percent.

To your point, we need to encourage policies that will empower and strengthen families and will create taxpayers, and that will pass on that

work ethic to the next generation that made the Drakes a successful, value-adding American family. Not only do they serve their community now in their church, Vonna serves as a nurse, Mike is an aviator in the Army. He went in out of high school, got himself educated and pursued a professional career in aviation. He is a valuable member of our community.

And we need thousands and thousands of families across our districts because they are the ones who bear the burden. They are the ones who make the investment, as President Clinton likes to say. And I think of all of the dollars lost by investing in areas where it was going to create no future and create no value.

At the end of the day, unless we bring about fundamental changes in accountability, in 1,443 days this economy is going to be hurt. My friends and neighbors are going to be hurt. Small business job creation opportunities are going to be hurt because of keeping people from having that opportunity to invest and to build a future for themselves.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I turn to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for some closing words.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate two stories that I came across concerning these tax cuts.

Jim Tracy from Shelbyville, Tennessee, who is the owner of a small insurance agency, he said because of the tax cuts, he was able to use the \$7,200 that he would have otherwise spent on taxes, and he bought seven new computers for his business and he hired a fourth employee. That is just one of many.

There is another story here. Kenneth Leupp of Archbold Refuse Service in Archbold, Ohio, he says, "The tax cuts, changes in depreciation schedules and increases in dollar amount we can expense off are very welcome changes. We have made purchases we wouldn't have made under the old laws. We've saved money on taxes, increased efficiency, lowered maintenance costs, and helped stimulate the economy."

Those are just two of thousands and thousands of experiences out there because of these tax cuts. Our purpose here tonight, although I may be repeating myself, I know that people watching C-SPAN tune in and out, but I just want to remind them that in 1,443 days, it is the countdown to the Democratic tax increase. All they have to do is run the clock out. They don't even have to act on them.

So on January 1, 2011, there will be a \$200 billion tax increase to the American people. The death tax will expire, capitol gains tax, tax on dividends will expire in January of 2009. A record number of Americans are invested in the stock market with mutual funds and retirement funds. The child tax credit will be cut in half over the next couple of years. The marriage penalty will be back in place, and low-income

taxpayers will go from a 10 percent tax bracket to a 15 percent tax bracket if we don't act.

The American people need to be aware of this. And in less than 4 years, if they don't communicate to their Members of Congress that they want to see these tax cuts extended, their voices need to be heard.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is the chairman of the Countdown Crew where we come in weekly and talk about tax policy.

There is nothing magical about tax policy. There is nothing sacred about it. There are various terms and provisions. We ought to be about trying to find an efficient tax collection scheme that allows for voluntary compliance, a scheme that is easy to comply with and costs the least amount of money possible to comply with, but raises the minimum amount of money needed to fund the Federal Government.

The policy we have in place is incredibly complicated. I am a CPA, and I have spent 32-plus years in business, both complying with the tax law and trying to help other folks comply with the tax law. It is unnecessarily complicated, but it is the one we have got. The provisions we have, as has been mentioned tonight, the current rate on capital gains tax, the current rate on interest, the 179 deduction, the various marginal tax rates, all of those, while there is nothing cast in concrete or stone about that, nevertheless if you look at the results we have had since they were implemented in 2001 and 2003, this economy has grown with those tax policies in place.

Could the economy have grown with other tax policies in place? Certainly, but that would be a guess as to whether or not that happened. The truth is we know these were in place and we know what happened with respect to the economy since they have been in place, since they brought us out of the recession of 2000–2001.

GEOFF mentioned his taxpayer that he talks about. The guy I think about when we talk about raising taxes is a fellow working morning tour for a drilling rig company, probably the derrick man. He probably has the most exciting job on a drilling rig. Most drilling rigs of any substance have 15 to 30-foot substructure from the ground to the floor of the rig, and then they have a mast on top of that of something in excess of 100 feet. And the derrick man's job is to stand at about 90-plus feet above the substructure, so he is 120 feet in the air, and works. It is hard work. It is physically demanding and dangerous work. He is making good money. He works 8 hours and if he is lucky some weeks he gets overtime.

That is how he feeds his, and I say "he," most of them are men, that is how he feeds his family. When we talk about raising taxes on individuals, I don't think about Bill Gates or Warren Buffett. I think about that guy working morning tour, for example, for

Parker Drilling, or Patterson Drilling which is based in Snyder, Texas, who comes to work at 11 at night and works until 7 in the morning, and gets in a car with the other four guys on the crew and they drive home and he sleeps during the day. That is how he feeds his family. That work is 7 days a week for the most part. It is a hard job.

That is who I think about when we talk about raising taxes.

So we will be coming back here again next week on the first night back to highlight again. We will have peeled off another 7 days that we have before the automatic tax increase. We have a good colleague who gets all over us about mandatory spending. Well, this is a mandatory tax increase headed our direction, as our colleague from Pennsylvania said, if we simply run out the clock.

It will have been 18 days at that point in time since the last tax increase. We are not aware of any tax increases on the floor this week. But hang onto your wallet. Given the way so far our colleagues have run the shop, you don't get a lot of heads up on this stuff. It just comes to the floor. They could have something up their sleeve as part of the CR that would raise taxes and do all kinds of things. And I don't want to taunt them, but again not going through committee and doing regular order leads to the kind of blindsided unexpectedness where that can happen.

It has been 11 days since the first tax increase, and others are on the way.

I want to thank my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Georgia and Kentucky, and also from Oklahoma, for helping us out tonight.

REVOLUTIONIZING AMERICA'S ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to continue the effort to revolutionize American energy. We had the first breakthrough here just about a week and a half ago where the U.S. House of Representatives took the first step in the clean energy revolution.

I think it was long overdue, and I think it is going to be much enjoyed by Americans, because what we did about a week and a half ago was take the first step toward freeing ourselves from the shackles of oil and gas and in fact starting down the road toward clean energy with a high-tech clean energy future.

The way we did that, we reeled back in \$14 billion of giveaways to the oil and gas industry, the most profitable industry in the history of the solar system, that had been given under the previous Congress; and we put that money

for Americans to use to develop a clean energy future that can depend upon Midwestern farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks.

This really was a first step on a long road toward a clean energy future for America. It was a very, very important first step.

This evening I wanted to share with my colleagues some folks I have met whose lives are intertwined with that clean energy future.

We call the clean energy future the new Apollo Project because we believe we need a new high-tech energy future for this country every bit as bold and revolutionary and visionary as John Kennedy's original Apollo Project when he stood behind me in 1961 and said America was going to place a man on the Moon and bring him back safely in 10 years, and that happened.

We believe that we need that same spirit, that same idea that our genius, our innovation and inventiveness in America can create new technologies to provide us new energy.

The people I wanted to talk about tonight are all people I have met in the last month and are people who I believe exhibit why we need the new Apollo energy project and why it was a good idea for Congress to have created this clean energy fund, take money out of oil and gas and put it into clean energy. I would like to talk about some of those folks.

The first two people I want to talk about are exhibits A and B as to why we need a new clean energy future.

One is President Note of the Marshall Islands who is a gracious fellow. I met him on Bainbridge Island awhile back.

□ 2115

When I talked to him, he told me about the plight of his Nation, the Marshall Islands in the southern Pacific, very, very low atolls. They are essentially coral reefs, and they are just a few feet above sea level. What the President of the Marshall Islands told me is that his Nation is now threatened by sea level rises associated with global warming, together with the coral reefs that can be occasioned by acidification in the ocean and increasing water temperature, again because of global warming and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

What President Note told me is that, for the last year or so, they have had to take emergency provisions to keep the sea from encroaching where they live, essentially. They are now starting to have active consideration of where folks will have to go after they leave the Marshall Islands when the seas swallow the Marshall Islands or make them uninhabitable.

Another problem they are having is the storms are increasing in severity as well.

So here we have the President of a nation state who was in Seattle this weekend pleading for us to take measures to stop global warming to try to preserve his nation. I thought this

could be the first nation really destroyed by environmental catastrophe associated with an energy policy that is polluting the atmosphere with so much carbon dioxide.

President Note was pretty convincing that as an act of humanity we should not allow his nation to drown, and to me it was sort of a common-sense, human thing to do, to ask me to talk to my colleagues about what we could do about that, and so I am here tonight.

The second person I want to talk about is the director of relocation for a town called Shishmareff, which is a town on the northern coast of Alaska. This is a town that has been there for 4,000 years in some village system or otherwise. For 4,000 years, people have enjoyed living there, but now they are being swallowed by the sea. The Arctic Ocean is essentially intruding into the town.

If you go and google Shishmareff, Alaska, you will see pictures of the houses simply falling down into the ocean. For a combination of reasons, the tundra is melting underneath their houses, and the ocean is intruding because an ice barrier that formerly protected their village has melted. So they are both having the tundra melt underneath them and the storm waves coming in and washing away the town.

About 3 weeks ago, the town voted to move 13 miles, move the whole town, kit and caboodle, to the mainland. They are now on a coastal barrier island, and this will be the first town, Shishmareff, Alaska, the first town that falls victim to global warming in the United States, the first American town.

I cannot be thinking that that is something to be proud of, that we have an energy policy that allows the oil and gas industry and others to put untold amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It is actually destroying an American town.

I think we ought to rally to the idea that we do not allow American towns to be swallowed by a problem. We have got to solve the problem.

So there are two people, the President of the Marshall Islands and the leader of Shishmareff, Alaska, both of whom are having their communities literally being swallowed up and having to move at some point because we have an energy policy that is fit for the 19th century, not the 21st century.

That is the bad news, but now I want to shift to some people I have met who have given me a huge amount of confidence that we can deal with this problem. Because I think if you spend time talking to the scientists and the inventors and innovators, as I have during the last year, you would be convinced that Americans, the country that had people who invented the light bulb, the jet airplane, went to the moon, perfected the Internet and mapped the human genome, are capable of creating a new energy future that will not allow the destruction of other American

towns. The reason I believe that is because I know these people. I just want to share some of the people I have met in the last month.

Last Friday, I met people from a company called General Compression, and these are scientists who have invented a way to make a compressor about 80 percent more efficient which does not sound too thrilling, I suppose, until you think what it can do. Because what they can do with this compressor is put it on the top of a wind turbine and use the wind turbine that blows in the wind to compress air and then take that air and can pump it down into subterranean caverns and keep stored air under high pressure that then can be vented and used like a big battery. When you vent this compressed air, it can drive a turbine and generate electricity.

Now, the upshot of all this technology is it means that we can take wind turbines and essentially connect them to a giant battery in the form of compressed air to store that energy. This is very, very important in the effort to have clean energy because now we can make wind turbines part of the grid. We can have energy that wind turbines create. We can have access to it even when the wind does not blow. Wind does not always blow, except here in the House of Representatives, of course.

So this, for the first time, when this technology is perfected, and it is not perfect yet, will be able to perhaps double the revenues that can be generated from wind turbines, a clean energy source that does not emit one pound of carbon dioxide when we generate that electricity.

So here is a tremendous breakthrough that could make radical changes in our energy policy by perhaps doubling the efficacy, at least the revenue generation of wind turbine farms. We have had a bunch of them go up in the State of Washington. We have the largest wind turbine farm in North America in the State of Washington, which is already as cheap as any other type of energy that we have. So there is one company.

The second company, the day before I had in my office a company called A123 Battery. It is a company in Massachusetts, scientists who have spun off of MIT, largely; and A123 Battery company is a company that has developed a lithium ion battery which has tremendous capacity essentially for storing electricity. They have now signed an agreement with General Motors in an effort to provide the battery for the Volt, the first plug-in hybrid that GM has announced they would like to build in several years.

A123 Battery company, it is exciting because their technology, once it becomes commercialized, once it becomes packaged in a reliable source that we can make sure we can put in our car, will allow us to have plug-in hybrids, a car that we can take home at night, plug into a garage outlet, next day

drive it up to 40 miles on electricity. And over 60 percent of our trips are under 40 miles a day, but if you want to go over 40 miles a day, then you have an auxiliary internal combustion engine that will burn either gasoline or ethanol that can take you the rest of the mileage as far as you want to drive.

So it is a plug-in, flex-fuel hybrid vehicle. Plug-in meaning you plug in at night, flex-fuel meaning runs on a gasoline or ethanol, and hybrid means it has electric and internal combustion engine.

So this company now has sort of answered the \$64,000 question of how we are going to have enough battery capacity; and all they need to do, as they explained to me, is to mount some engineering. The science is there. Now they need the engineering.

This is very exciting to think that in 5, maybe 6, 7 years, we will be able to have an electrical driven car, by and large, that we can distribute energy over the electrical system.

Think about when you put those two companies I just talked about, put those two companies together. General Compression, which can perhaps double the efficacy of the wind turbine, that can generate electricity that goes out over the wires to your garage, that you plug in your car at night and drive off and get 40 miles on electricity and unlimited mileage on your gas or ethanol, a clean system, with zero carbon dioxide emissions. There is some pretty good news, and they are not the only one.

Now maybe we will not have wind turbine-driven electricity. Maybe we will have clean coal. You know, most of the energy is from coal, from electricity right now in the United States, and it is very dirty, huge gigatons of carbon dioxide which are responsible for global warming, but there may be a way we can burn it cleanly.

We can put it through a combined cycle process that can take the carbon dioxide out of the stream. We turn the coal into hydrogen. We burn the hydrogen in a gas turbine, and that generates electricity. But we have got to have some place to put the carbon dioxide so it does not get in the atmosphere. We basically sequester it, and we pump it under high pressure into the ground, and it stays there for hundreds of years, but it takes a lot of energy to compress that CO₂. For every two coal-fired plants, you have to have one just for the energy to suppress this CO₂.

But a company I talked to yesterday called RAMGEN in Tacoma, Washington, RAMGEN has a nascent technology using a very sophisticated technology to increase the efficiency of compressors by very significant amounts, which would allow us to compress this carbon dioxide and use much less electricity to do it.

So here we have a situation where we have these three companies I just talked about that may mean we would be able to have affordable, clean coal

electricity to go into our electrical grid to power our plug-ins; and, if not that, then we have wind turbine technology to power our plug-ins with a battery that works.

That is a beautifully elegant system that can keep the Shishmareff towns and the Marshall Islands that are being swallowed by the sea and keep us having cars that do not have to drive on oil from the Middle East. That is a pretty nice system. So there is a lot of great news out there, because there is a lot of great innovation out there.

But the question is, what can we here in Congress do to accelerate that rate and that pace of innovation, and this is the third thing I would like to address tonight. We have talked about the problem. We have talked about the people who are solving it, innovation, but we have a role here, too, to help accelerate that rate of innovation.

I would like tonight to talk about some of the things, not all of the things, but some of the things we can do here in Congress.

First, what we can do is try to accelerate the rate of the commercialization of this plug-in hybrid battery. It is still going to take some engineering to make sure the battery is put in sequence in a crash-worthy system.

We can pass a bill I introduced last week with some colleagues called the grid plug-in hybrid vehicle bill that will use some of this \$14 billion that we have set aside for research that will help this industrial application get off the ground. It would also provide incentives for consumers to buy these products so we can help increase the demand for them; and, of course, we know once we increase demand, the cost of these goes down, the more we have on the road.

The bill would also create a Federal testing ground. We have several of these now that help prove the concept of these—that prove these concepts work, and we would build on that by providing another test facility to certify the safety and reliability of these systems.

So here is one bill that can help speed this transition to an electrical driven car, and we are very close to doing it. It may happen without Federal action, later rather than sooner, but we cannot wait. We cannot wait because of our dependence on foreign oil, and we cannot wait as the scientific panel will come out with its report this Friday again noting the danger we face as a country as a result of global warming.

So that is one thing we can do, pass this plug-in, flex-fuel hybrid vehicle bill.

Secondly, what we can do is make it easier for people to generate their own electricity. You know, photovoltaic energy where you put solar cells on your roof is becoming close to being market-driven. There are some very, very exciting things going on in photovoltaic energy right now.

A company in California called NanoSolar is producing 450 megawatts

of thin cell solar cells which they hope will decrease the cost of photovoltaic cells dramatically, another company called MiaSole. But we want to make it easier for you. If you want to put it on your roof, when you generate more electricity, you are feeding it back into the grid, to basically—to sell electricity you grow at your home, home-grown electricity back to the utility company.

□ 2130

We want to make sure that you can get paid for that. So we have another bill called the net metering bill. Net metering basically means that you net on your meter what you used from the utility against what you produce and sell back to the utility.

This bill would create a right for you as a consumer, under certain rules that were set up, to sell your electricity back to your utility, make sure you can hook up, have a Federal standard to do that. That is the key to being able to get to what we call a distributed generation system, where we can have generators all around the country, including on our rooftops and our businesses and our homes, not just in large coal plants and large hydro-electric dams.

This is a pretty simple thing to do. It has been blocked now for 4 years in Congress. We are hoping that it can get through this year, a simple thing to do.

Third, we have got to increase our research and development in all of these high-tech energy fields. I just mentioned several of them. There are many others, wave power. We now have the first wave power plant that has been proposed off the coast of Oregon, 50 megawatts, with buoys that bob up and down underneath the surface that can generate very considerable electricity. There is enough electricity that could be generated off a 10-by-10 square mile area off the coast of California that, if the buoys can be shown to survive ocean conditions, can have all the electricity California could use. It is pretty amazing.

Now, there are hurdles to show that these buoys can survive in the wave power, but we need to do more in the wave conditions. We need to do more R&D on this. We need more R on the clean coal. We need more R&D on the solar thermal, which we are having great success with lately.

The reason we know this is because when we compare this to other major challenges, we are really pathetic. We are pathetic when it comes to doing R&D and energy right now.

You know, this challenge we have is at least as visionary as going to the Moon, but it affects our planet rather than the Moon. Yet we are spending one-seventh of what was spent and invested in the new Apollo Project, one-seventh per year what we spent on getting to the Moon.

That is a sad commentary on our failure to act with dispatch when it comes to energy. We would not have

gotten to the Moon, probably ever, had we had such a skimpy, weak, pathetic amount of research into this basic science. We have all this explosion of information going on between nanotechnology and biofuels, which we haven't even yet talked about tonight. We have got to ramp up that Federal R&D. That is the third thing we need to do.

Fourth, we need to have major steps forward to advance our biofuels potential in this country. We have enormous potential in this country for biofuels. I have read the last few days some articles and newspapers by pundits who get to say anything they want. They don't ever have to run for election, so it doesn't matter what it is, really, I suppose.

But these pundits have suggested that biofuels could not play an important part of our role, and those people are not talking to the scientists who recognize the breakthrough technology that we are on the cusp of enjoying in this country to dramatically increase the productivity of biofuels. Now, we know we are already producing very significant sums of ethanol and some biodiesel in this country. We know that that can increase.

But what folks don't understand is that these biofuels, we are ready to take giant leaps forward to leapfrog the corn ethanol that we now use, and corn ethanol right now is what we might think of as the first-generation biofuel. It is kind of like the Wright brothers' flier. It works, you can fly, but it is just a start. We are going to enjoy succeeding generations of biofuels.

The first one that we will have will be cellulosic ethanol. Cellulosic ethanol is a fancy term that basically means instead of just using the seed of a plant to distill ethanol, you use the whole plant. You don't just use a kernel of the corn. You use everything, what they call the corn stover that grows above the ground. You mash it up, and you put an enzyme in it to break down the carbohydrates in the cell, then you distill the carbohydrates and you make ethanol.

When we do this, we will increase the productivity of the Midwestern farmer by a factor of two or three, not 5 or 10 percent, but by a factor of two or three. We will generate two or three times as much energy and money per acre as we are generating right now. This technology is ready for the first commercial plant, which should be in Idaho, a company called Iogen, that is ready as soon as they get a loan guarantee from Uncle Sam so they can build the first commercial plant to do this.

When we do this, we will be able to have a very significant amount of our transportation fueled by domestically produced biofuel. This is not me just saying this. This is the Department of Energy that has done extensive analyses of this, Department of Agriculture, a whole suite of agronomists

who have looked at it, who have basically concluded that in 25 years we can have 25 to 30 percent of our transportation fuels fueled by this, by this stream of domestically produced ethanol.

That is just a beginning. That is a second generation. A third generation could include algae. Algae has the capability of producing 50 times as much at least per acre as even the second generation of biofuels.

There is at least one company that has at least one commercial application of that technology now, basically to make diesel fuel out of algae. That is the kind of thing we need to invest in, and that is what we need to start doing.

Last, I want to mention something that is pivotal to driving these technologies, and that is the technologies that I have talked about tonight all operate under an enormous competitive disadvantage. They have to compete with other industries that have a huge subsidy that they don't get, and that's the subsidy that the fossil fuel industry has because they get to put their carbon dioxide, their pollution, in the atmosphere for free.

Now, you think about that. If a coal-fired utility right now can put its garbage, its pollution, its carbon dioxide, its pollutant that is damaging the Earth's atmosphere, that is damaging the atmosphere by the megaton and not pay a dime for it, in unlimited amounts, now, compared to what you do and what we do when we go to our county garbage dump with a pickup full of stuff out of our garden, goodness knows what we have got in the back of our basements, we have to pay money to dump our stuff in a limited space, because there is only a limited space in a garbage dump.

But utilities that put all this pollution in our atmosphere, which has limited carrying capacity for carbon dioxide, get to do it for free for as much as they want. That is a huge subsidy of those industries.

If you are a small company in California building solar cells or ocean-powered technology or wind turbines, or if you are a farmer in Ohio that is going to build cellulosic ethanol and sell it, you don't get that subsidy. It is an unfair subsidy, and it needs to stop.

The U.S. Congress needs to stand up on our hind legs and pass a cap and trade system to cap, to limit, to put a ceiling on the amount of carbon dioxide that can go in our atmosphere from these polluting industries. When we have that cap, when we limit the amount of carbon dioxide that can be put in, two things are going to happen.

We are going to protect our atmosphere for our grandchildren; and, second, we are going to give a boost to these new businesses that are really ready to start producing these products to become commercially available for the clean energy future of this country. That is a big two-fer, a clean, healthy environment and an energetic economy.

All of the things I have talked about tonight will help produce both things. This is a situation where we are going to have the cleanest policy in congressional history and the most robust economy in American history once we develop these new technologies, because we need to be the country that fulfills our destiny as being the inventors of the world.

You know, China is going to need this technology. They are building one dirty coal-fired plant a week, and they are going to need clean energy technology. We should be the one selling it to them.

Here is a great way to restore the imbalance of trade between us and China. One of these companies, the director of Ramgen, this company that may be able to do this clean coal technology, was going to China today, and here is a perfect example of how we can start to fix this terrible trade imbalance we have when we can be the sellers to the world to this clean energy technology.

So, in summary, there is some good news and bad news here tonight. The bad news is we have some fellow Americans whose talent is being destroyed by global warming in Shishmareff, Alaska.

We have a fellow citizen in the world, the Marshall Islands, whose country is being devoured by global warming. That is the bad news.

But the good news is we have a great combination of innovators, inventors, business people that are ready to tackle this problem and create these new technological solutions to this problem. One day we will be driving clean cars. We will have cleaner homes with better efficiency. We are going to lick this problem of global warming at the same time we are going to grow the U.S. economy.

That is a message that this Congress, I am proud to say, is now sending for the first time. We have broken the chains of the oil and gas industry. We have broken the chains of the 19th century, and we have entered a new century of clean energy technology.

I will look forward to more successes so we can help Americans continue to invent. It really is the American destiny to pass the new Apollo energy project and do just what John F. Kennedy did, take this country to a new vision.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. I just have come to the floor on behalf of the 30-something Working Group. As you know, and as the Members know, we work daily and weekly on issues that are facing the American people and also to not only inform Members of Congress but also allow the

American people to get a closer glimpse of what is happening here in the Capitol dome and what is not happening here under the dome.

I am proud to report that there were a couple of days, we only worked 3 days last week, or 4, to allow the minority party to have their retreat. During that time, Speaker PELOSI and a number of other chairmen traveled to Iraq and Afghanistan to visit our troops and also our commanders in the field.

I can share with you that the trip will be talked about a little further by the Speaker tomorrow, but it is very, very important because it is the number one thing that is facing the Nation right now, and that is war in Iraq and also in Afghanistan.

Last week we spoke or talked here on the floor about the importance of the President's State of the Union, what was said and what was not said. There was some level of focus on the fact that Katrina was not mentioned not one time during the President's State of the Union, with me being from a hurricane State and representing a district that is constantly hit by hurricanes and natural disasters, just being one season away. Katrina, noted as one of the worst natural disasters of our time and one of the worst responses by this Federal Government, did not receive even a mention from the President of the United States.

I can say that there are several Members here in Congress that continue to be concerned about Katrina and the area of housing and follow-through and preparedness on behalf of our first emergency responders, or that they have the tools to respond, but making sure that FEMA has the proper oversight to be able to carry out the tasks needed in the event of a natural disaster or terrorist attack.

One other thing I think is important to be able to identify is veterans were not pointed out in this State of the Union. Looking at Katrina and the State of the Union, we must come to grips with there are two hard realities. One, if we have a natural disaster or a planned terrorist attack that takes place in this country, is the Federal Government ready to respond, especially on behalf of the executive branch? That question is still left unanswered.

At the same time, when we start looking at issues of veterans, looking at our troops, our men and women coming home, what will be the state of affairs on behalf of those veterans?

I am saying all of this to line up the debate that is going to take place after this week when we pass the continuing resolution that will be on the floor on Wednesday of this week, of what is going to happen the following week after that when the President sends his budget to Congress.

It is important within that budget to embrace some of the values of the American people and even legislation that we have filed in the 110th Congress and also that was filed in the 109th Congress.

□ 2145

I think it is important, also, to outline the fact that Americans continue to disapprove of the direction that the President is heading in dealing with the troop escalation in Iraq. I will be looking forward to hearing more about the Speaker's trip not only tomorrow in her press conference but also when she shares not only with the Democratic Caucus but with this House of Representatives.

And to see after the State of the Union, the President's polling numbers drop even to another low. What I understand from some reports, as low as 30, 28 percent. I know the President is not going to win a popularity contest, but I think it is important to be able to follow the will and desire of the American people and on behalf of the Congress.

Also, I took the opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, before coming to the floor, to take a look at what congressional leaders are saying, not just on the Democratic side of the aisle but even on the Republican side of the aisle, and there is a great debate that is going on. I pull here the Congressional Daily AM, which pretty much any staffer or Member of Congress involved in the process here in Washington, D.C., can pick it up and find out what is going on throughout the whole week; and on a number of the issues that are going to face the President, some of his strongest supporters here in Congress are disagreeing with him at this point. I think this could only boil down to Members of Congress using common sense and standing up on behalf of their constituents, either it be an entire State, if you are a Senator, or Member of Congress that represents a district. I think it is important that we exercise those values.

There will be an up-or-down vote on how the Senate feels about the troop escalation in Iraq; and I believe, reading here, that the Democratic leader, Mr. REID, has said that that vote will be taken and that there will be a number of Republicans that are going to have to take that vote because there are going to be 21 seats to defend in the Senate in the 2008 elections.

Now, saying that, Mr. Speaker and Members, this is not about politics. This is about standing up on behalf of the American people. I think Senator WEBB said it best, Mr. Speaker and Members, that if the President doesn't want to lead us in the right direction, then we need to show him the way, something along those lines. And I think it is important on behalf of the men and women that are in harm's way now and the fact that we have oversight as the legislative body in this three-branch government that we exercise our rights in this.

I want to read just a little bit here, continue from page 1 over to page 2: "Warner's opposition to sending more troops was a heavy blow to the White House and administrative officials that hoped that the former Senate Armed

Services chairman, one-time Navy Secretary would help convince colleagues to support the plan." I think it is important that the Senator and past chairman of that committee stand up on behalf of the American people in what is right, and I commend that on a bipartisan basis.

I think the American people and Members here in the House know exactly where Democrats stand on this issue of making sure that we bring about the kind of oversight but at the same time not just standing by and saying, well, the President is Commander in Chief; and he is making all the decisions.

I see my good friend, Congressman MURPHY, is here.

If this was left up to politics, then we would just stand back and allow the President to continue to do what he is doing, and then we could have Ground Hog Day all over again, as we had in November, Democrats continuing to gain power because of the lack of leadership on behalf of the Republican leadership to stand up to the President of the United States.

But this is not about politics. This is about protecting the American people. This is about making sure that their will and desires are represented here in the people's House, in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I am pretty sure in the Senate.

And I am hoping that Democrats and Republicans will come together. As you know, Mr. Speaker and Members, here in the 30-Something Working Group, we embrace bipartisanship. We encourage bipartisanship. And the good thing about serving in an elected body is when you are right and you are on the side of the people, then you will return back to this body. If you are wrong, I used to play football down at Florida A&M, and we used to say the blind leading the blind and the two shall fall in the ditch.

So I think it is important that if we know that the American people are looking for a new direction versus the same direction that the President was taking in the 109th and 108th Congress, the wrong direction as it relates to Iraq, then that is a decision that every Member of Congress has to make.

Mr. MURPHY, I am so happy that you are able to join us right now. I was just talking a little bit about what we finished off on last week. I talked about the fact that the Speaker was in theater, two theaters, in Iraq and also in Afghanistan. She just returned. She will be having a press conference tomorrow to talk about that a little more. The fact that on Wednesday we will be debating the continuing resolution and will be here on the floor. We will have a follow-up.

The President's budget will be handed down, I think, February 5, and some of the things which were not mentioned in the State of the Union, Hurricane Katrina and the victims of Hurricane Katrina and those Gulf States and also veterans that were left out of the

State of the Union speech, which is going to be the next major wave that this country is going to be facing. How we are going to deal with the influx of new veterans coming into the system? And you pretty much heard the rest when you joined us.

But, welcome, and I yield to you.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you for yielding, Mr. MEEK.

You talked about our commitment, failed commitment, over the past several years of Republican rule in this House to our veterans, and I think of what message we send, Mr. Speaker and Members, to the young men and women who are coming back to this country who have fought for us in a war that they are beginning to understand, I think, has been so badly mismanaged and a war in which this Congress has so miserably overseen for the past 3, 4 years. But I also think about what message it sends to prospective young men and women who may want to join our Armed Forces, because we are so lucky in this country to have an all-volunteer military, and it is a blessing for each and every one of us who lives under this blanket of freedom that our volunteer military provides.

The message that we are sending them today, Mr. MEEK and Mr. Speaker, is that, one, when we send them into battle, we are not going to do it in a way that protects them with the armor and equipment that they need, that we are not prepared to send them into a conflict that we have planned for in advance for success.

But, even given all that, that when they come back to this country, unconscionably, we are not going to make sure that they have the health care that they need, that they won't wait in lines for procedures that they need, that they won't have to pay exorbitant amounts of money out of pocket for the drugs that they need to treat the injuries that they suffered on behalf of this Nation.

So for me, Mr. Speaker and Members, the issue of veterans really ties it all together for us because it talks about the values that we have as a Nation to those who have served. It talks about the misguided policies of this administration and the peril that we have put these young men and women in.

As 30-Somethings that get to stand here and as a very new member of this group, we all have friends and cousins and brothers and sisters who are fighting there, and we hear the stories firsthand from our generation or those just a few years younger than us as they come back, and the stories only get worse. We give credit to those who served, and we should give them the benefit of their service when they return here.

And I think you are very right, Mr. MEEK, to point out that that was a very noticeable absence from the President's speech, to give credit to them not just in words, not just in Veterans Day and Memorial Day ceremonies, but in the acts and in the funding that this

body is charged to provide for those men and women both when they are abroad serving for this country and here at home. And having watched the 30-Somethings do work on this floor, I know what great advocates you have been for those men and women who have served for us, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I can tell you right now that a number of those issues that we have been talking about over the last couple of 30-Something hours that we have had here on the floor, and we thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this, this is a very pivotal time. And I always share with the Members, even though we come to the capital, Mr. Speaker, from our districts on a weekly basis, work together here on this highly secured complex, the sun rises and sets every day in this beautiful capital city as we look over the capital Mall, and sometimes we take the very freedom that others have provided for granted and the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to lead.

I think when historians start to look at this time when there are two wars going on, when you have millions of Americans without health care, when you have Gulf States that are there that feel that they have been forgotten, when you have veterans in the heartland of America and urban America still sharing some of the same wounds of a lack of leadership on behalf of the Congress, when you have veterans that are waiting 3 months to see the ophthalmologist, and when you have veterans clinics, VA hospitals and clinics, some clinics that are only open twice a month with a staff that rotates between that region that serves those veterans, people will look back and say, what happened in the 109th Congress or what happened in 110th Congress? Who stood up? Who stood up on behalf of the American people?

I have a great deal of respect for the President and the Commander in Chief, because he is the President and Commander in Chief, period. That is where it is. I am an American. I am not an enlisted man, but I am a Member of Congress, and I feel that the office deserves the respect.

I also believe that the American people deserve, Mr. MURPHY, the same level of respect or greater. And the great thing about our democracy, like I said, we celebrate the very freedom that others have provided us. Some of those paid the ultimate sacrifice for that to happen. Some are sitting in wheelchairs right now. Some are forever mentally wounded or injured by the whole experience in providing the kind of freedom that they provided for us. Some of us take for granted that we have veterans, some that are going into VA hospitals that are sitting there practically all day for mental health counseling. Some are not eligible. Some are still fighting for full benefits. And over the years, I know of some of my constituents all the way from the Korean War who are still fighting for

full benefits to be granted by the Veterans Administration, seeing these individuals in the state that they are in now, under years of a Congress that has not paid attention.

And just a little history lesson here, I will just share with you, the chairman, I believe, in the 109th, the 108th Congress, the Republican chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee went against the Republican leadership saying, I believe this is what we should do on behalf of the veterans. I believe that they deserve it. And he was removed as chairman of that committee.

Those days are gone now. We are in control. We are going to stand up on their behalf.

I am just saying I don't want to point out the fact that the President did not mention anything about veterans, just that it is a bad thing. It is a bad thing. I think he should have mentioned it, especially at a time of war. But I want to make sure those veterans know, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to leave them behind, that we are not going to let their memory kind of fade off, their contributions fade off into the sunset because the President did not prioritize enough to even put two words together to thank our veterans, or just "veterans," period, just one word. Because he left that out of his speech doesn't necessarily mean that this House of Representatives is going to leave those veterans behind. So that is the reason why we mentioned it. That is the reason why we raise up the Katrina victims and those families that are still living through the nightmare.

And, Mr. MURPHY, we are not even focusing on the whole family experience. I mean, think of those families of veterans that are out there. And the reason why I am mentioning the whole mental piece is because, when I traveled to Iraq, I can tell you I used to be a State trooper. I have seen some things in my 5 years being with the Florida Highway Patrol. I am pretty sure in one tour in Iraq, a young man or young woman or a middle-aged gentleman or what have you, when you see that kind of activity, it is going to affect you. You are going to need the kind of the assistance that this country should provide because you volunteered, taking your words, to fight on behalf of this country. So it is very, very important.

And those families that are having to live with those family members that are trying to wrestle with those issues, some of those issues don't make the local news, but they live it. Children are subjected to it, and many of our veterans need counseling when they come back.

□ 2200

And that is one of the hidden issues that is in this whole issue as we start talking about not leaving our veterans behind. We have plans to do that. We started this discussion just talking about the President's budget, about making sure that this is reflected in the President's budget.

Before I yield back to you in like 30 seconds, the President is going to go to Illinois tomorrow, and he is going to be in New York after that, visiting, pushing his economic plan. I can tell you right now, I wish I had an envelope, but I remember Johnnie Carson used to hold an envelope to his head and say a word, and I would say make tax breaks permanent for the superwealthy.

You know, I am pretty sure that is somewhere in that envelope. Even though we are going to go around, we are going to go to Caterpillar in Illinois and talk about trade and how the economy works, and then he is going to go over to New York and talk a little bit about the economy and how strong, this, that and the other. But in the end game, it is going to be about protecting the very individuals that have been rewarded and protected at a time of war, to make it permanent, so that the middle class will not have the benefits that they need.

So we highlight these things as a forecast of saying that there is some room for the American people, everyday Joe and Sue, and those individuals that are punching in and punching out every day, for those individuals that are trying to make it to the next level that there is something there to assist them.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MEEK was right on. The new class that was sent here to Washington was sent here to make sure that this place is returned to that hard-working family that you are talking about.

You know, we know the statistics, the terrible statistics of the number of military families that are on food stamps, the number of military families, ex-military families that have to come to the government for some assistance just to get by every day. I mean, these are amongst the legions of families across this country that are scraping to get by every day.

We have a growing economy. You know the story, Mr. MEEK. We have a growing economy. Production is up. GDP is up. And wages are flat. Wages for regular, ordinary Americans are going nowhere while wages for CEOs and the folks at the very top of that economic scale are doing very well.

And none of us begrudge folks that have done well in business making a dollar. I mean, that is the genius of our American economy. But what it does is it leaves all of those people behind while a very few at the top are well off.

Here is where we come in, I think. I think we come in in that our job, not necessarily to completely level that playing field, but our job certainly is not to exacerbate the differences that already exist. And when President Bush goes to Illinois, if he spends a little time moving away from the motorcade and the Secret Service lines, he will find a society there in which there are deep divisions between those folks in the middle that are just trying to cling on to that middle class, and the folks that are doing very well.

Our job, you know frankly, is to not make that situation worse. And the tax breaks that this previous Congress gave away to a lot of those oil companies, to the deals that they cut with the drug companies to give them record profits off this health care system, have left a lot of people behind, have left millions of hardworking Americans struggling, producing more, working harder than ever, and not seeing a return for their dollar.

You know the costs of this war. I have heard you talk about it on this floor. But we are spending \$8 billion a month in Iraq right now. And we need to start having a conversation about how we spend that money here in the United States of America, and how we use that money to retrain workers that have been laid off due to the globalization of our economy.

We need to talk about how to spend that money to get kids an education that they deserve, to get them out of school in 4 years, rather than what is all too often happening, that it takes 6, 8, 10 years for some students to get degrees. That is where we need to be investing.

That is the right thing for our economy. That is the right thing for our kids. And ultimately it is the right thing for our men and women that are fighting overseas. So I appreciate the focus that we are going to hopefully be able to add to the President's visit, to make sure that when he goes out there into the world that he sees all of America, that he does not just see the folks that have been the beneficiaries of the largesse of government in this Congress for all too long, the oil companies, the drug companies, the Fortune 500s, that he sees the rest of the folks that are struggling.

Now, he is going to get an opportunity, as you know, Mr. Speaker and Members, to do right by those folks, because hopefully we are going to get to his desk an increase in the minimum wage, we are going to get to his desk a decrease in the student loan rate. We are going to put on his desk for his signature a repeal of those massive tax breaks to the oil companies.

He is going to have a choice then, and I hope he listens to what happened on election day. I hope he listens to the legions of folks who sent us here, some of us for the first time and others back for another tour of duty in this Chamber. I hope that he listens to the folks that are asking this government to start sticking up for people that have had very little voice, very little voice except for some people standing here late at night trying to shed light on what has been really happening in this country, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, that is an outstanding segue to even talk about what has passed this floor already. You mentioned many of those measures. Eighty percent of the American people, overwhelmingly, Mr. Speaker, feel that the first 100 hours here in the U.S. House of Representa-

tives have been very fruitful and have put forth a great surge of support and hope on behalf of everyday working Americans.

Speaking of the minimum wage, I understand that it is up for consideration in the Senate next week, hopefully next Tuesday. I know there are some discussions an \$8 billion possible cost for tax breaks for businesses within that. I know that there will be some sort of discussion between the finance Chair in the Senate and Mr. RANGEL over here in the House, Mr. Speaker, from Ways and Means.

We are going to continue to have hearings on the economy. We are going to talk about globalization tomorrow in the committee, I believe at 10 a.m., over in the Longworth Building. We are going to the effects of it, how does it deal with the American worker, how do we benefit here. And that is going to be a great discussion for us to continue to have, especially with the President moving around and speaking to different groups about trade.

I think it is also important as we start to look at this issue of the minimum wage that we keep at the forefront. So I want to make sure that the Members stay engaged; I want to make sure that the American people stay engaged and informed on what is happening.

I think another issue that is coming up and I mentioned it a little earlier, on Wednesday, we are going to be dealing with the continuing resolution. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that were mentioned in the State of the Union, it is interesting what we have already incorporated into the House.

Democrats led the way in making sure that we adopt pay-as-we-go rules. Democrats led the way by saying that there will be no earmarks in this continuing resolution that will come to the floor on Wednesday. And we talk about earmarks. And we are bringing about earmark reform.

But earmarks in some areas, especially when you look at the bad situation that the country is in right now, this does not go away. I mean, we are continuing to hold this chart up. I just want to make sure that the American people and Members understand that we had very little to do with the situation of the \$1.05 trillion that has been borrowed from foreign nations, and more than has been borrowed over 224 years with 42 Presidents and a number of Congresses in between, of \$1.01 trillion.

We did not just get there. We got there by giving unaffordable tax breaks that we could not afford to the super-wealthy, giving away tax breaks to individuals who did not ask for it. So that just does not go away.

There is a lot of work between making sure that we are able to do what this Democratic Congress has done in balancing the budget and taking us into surpluses versus what the Republican Congress has done in taking us backwards.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. MURPHY, we are joined by my good friend from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). Mr. RYAN, we have been talking about a number of issues surrounding not only the Speaker's visit to Iraq and Afghanistan with some other Democratic leaders and also chairmen, but also talking about the issue of the veterans not being mentioned in the State of the Union, nor the Gulf States. But we said we are not going to leave them behind. So we gave an update on the minimum wage. We are happy to hear from you, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had an interesting weekend, and I am glad to be with you and our new friend from Connecticut. I had a very interesting weekend because everyone in Niles, Ohio, in the Mahoney Valley, was talking about the first 100 hours. So I found it very interesting that so many people were actually paying attention to what was going on here.

I think a lot of it had to do with Speaker PELOSI and the first woman Speaker being here. But there was a genuine excitement that things had changed in Washington, D.C. and I am sure you felt it in Miami. I know you were there. I talked to you last night. You were there. And I am sure they felt it up in New England.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You gave a couple of speeches over the weekend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I did, yeah. I actually spoke at the Akron Press Club, which I felt was very important. And then I spoke at Our Lady of Mt. Carmel grade school, my old Catholic grade school. And we had a little alumni affair there.

It was interesting, because there were so many people talking about what had happened down here, the historic nature of the changes. And when you look and you think about all of the political promises that we have probably all heard in our careers at one point or another about, we are going to do this, we are going to do that, and you hear people say that.

But for Speaker PELOSI and the majority here to lead and run campaigns all over the country and make those assertions and make these promises and then to come within the first 100 legislative hours and actually deliver on these issues is impressive. And I think it tries to restore some of that credibility that has been lost, I think, over the past couple of years.

So we immediately stabilized a lot of families. I mean, it is not implemented yet, but our goal: minimum wage, cut student loan interest rates in half and help negotiate down the cost of prescription drugs. And then open up two new sectors of the economy by repealing the corporate welfare and investing that in alternative energy sources, which will lead to more research from the private sector, investment by the private sector, and try to open up this new alternative energy sector of our economy, and then the stem cell research bill, which will allow us in the health care industry to open up and do

further research to move the economy forward.

So we are trying to do some compassionate stuff, some progressive stuff, but at the same time stabilize. It has been interesting. It has been fun to go back home. Mr. MEEK, as you remember the last couple of years, you would have to go back home, and you are talking to your constituents, and there is not a whole lot to say.

You know, we were often talking about what we were trying to prevent from happening, or motions to recommend or amendments we offered for PAYGO in all of those committees and Charlie Stenholm and Dennis Moore who offered all of those provisions to try to balance the budget by implementing PAYGO. Well, we implemented PAYGO from the House side.

I think it is very important that we were able to actually go out and do that. So I am excited about what is happening here.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, it is funny because there was kind of a low bar set. And I at some levels am pleased that I was not in the same shoes that Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK were, that I did not have to go back to my constituency for the last several years and answer for what has happened here, because the answer is, not much.

You know, folks out there were struggling with these energy prices just going through the roof. Health care was becoming harder and harder to find, good health care at least. People were crying out for work on immigration. People were trying to get help bringing up their wages to a liveable wage, and they were not hearing anything. I mean, it was deafening silence from down here.

So I do not have as much comparative experience as you, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, do. But walking around the district in Connecticut for the past several weekends it has been euphoric. And I used that word the last time I was down here with you.

It is really this sort of sense that, oh, my gosh, our government is working again. Our government is back to work again; and it used to be that that is what happened. It used to be that there would be a problem, you would go to your legislator, they would come down here and they would do something about it.

And people have come to expect inertia. That is what sort of was just the run of the mill down here in Washington, that you have a problem and then you have to wait about 5, 10 years, in order to get something to happen.

I felt the same thing, Mr. RYAN, that people you know, it is too bad frankly that people have come to be surprised by the fact that there could be immediate action. Because that is what they should get from their government, and they are getting it now.

□ 2215

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is exciting because it is just starting, Mr. MURPHY. It is just starting.

And when you meet with the Speaker and you see the intensity in her eyes and the focus about this was really just the beginning and we are not here to say, well, we did our first hundred hours and we are done. We are going to chalk it up and we are done. This is about continuing to move forward. We have got to reauthorize No Child Left Behind.

And when you talk to Chairman MILLER, who is the Chair of that committee, you see the look in his eyes about an opportunity to change the face of education in this country, to finally put some resources back behind No Child Left Behind to where it actually will work.

And when you look and you see, and I know, you know, Senator KENNEDY is talking about putting money in there to help school districts figure out how they can possibly extend the school day and extend the school year so that we can make sure that our kids are on par with kids from Korea and some of these other countries where they go an extra couple, 3 weeks a year more than us, which equals another year or two over the course of a 12-year education cycle. These are the kind of things that we want to implement here.

And if it wasn't for the, and we got into this, too, a lot back home. You know, a lot of people had an almost unrealistic expectation that we came in, we can come in now, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and wave a magic wand and all of a sudden there is a lot of money here. Well, we have got a lot of making up to do because of the irresponsible fiscal inadequacies and inability of the Republicans to actually balance the budget. So we have got to go up and clean that mess up. We have got to figure out how to extract ourselves from this morass we are in in Iraq and then finally make the investments that we want to make.

So we have got a lot going on here, Mr. MEEK, and we are very excited about the proposition that we have in the future. When you look at the opportunities that we really have in this country, I think they are great. But it is about focusing on the human capital in the United States of America, Mr. MURPHY, and making sure that we make the kind of investments into the health care, education in the United States and the stem cells and the alternative energy are going to put us on a strong path to move forward.

And I would be happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I will just key off of an important word there and that is investments. You know, how you balance the budget into the future is to make sure that you are doing the right things now to make sure that our economy is humming 10 years and 20 years from now. So when you talk about this investing in renewable and alternative energy sources, I mean, that is going to be our export. That is going to be what America can renew its economy around, is our abil-

ity to be the producer of all these new energy technologies.

When you talk about investing in education, making sure that kids are educated so that America, which right now grows as an economy because we have the best-trained, best-educated work force in the country, continues to be that beacon of economic development due to our work force. Those are the type of investments that have been long cast aside but now we are going to start making again so that we make sure that you know when we are long gone from here that we have left an economy and we have left a budget that makes sense.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

It was interesting, because one of our friends from the other side gave a 5-minute speech about the values of free trade. I think pretty much everything he said I agree with, and I voted against almost probably every trade agreement that has come before this Congress since I have been here. And I agreed with everything he said. We are trading. It creates value. It invests in our countries. We all understand all that.

The problem is that we are not making the investments into the United States that will help us grow new sectors of the economy that will replenish the jobs that we may be losing.

Now, people in Youngstown, Ohio, obviously, don't like to lose their jobs. But if there was a job there that they could get trained and go into and make the same kind of living and have the same stability for their family and provide for education and health care for their own family, they would be fine with it. So you can't have free trade and then not invest in the stem cell research. You can't have free trade and then not invest in the alternative energy research to help stimulate the economy and create new sectors that will ultimately yield employment for our folks in our communities.

Be happy to yield to Madam Chair of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you to my good friend from Youngstown, Ohio.

You know, your comments sort of bring to mind that our good friends on the other side of the aisle want to have their cake and eat it, too. They were the ones responsible for putting us in this situation where we have to adopt a continuing resolution that is essentially continuation funding that in order to put a finger in the dike and make sure that things don't get any worse and that we can begin the process for the 2008 budget and getting our fiscal house in order. It was them that only were able to pass two out of all of the spending bills that were in their hopper. It was them that left us this mess.

And now, you know, you will see over the next couple of days, Mr. MURPHY, our good friends on the other side of

the aisle actually stand up and criticize their own budget, which is what the CR is. They will try to put our colleagues on our side of the aisle who were just elected, who, you know, campaigned against fiscal irresponsibility in a box and make it seem like somehow this continuing resolution is what we crafted when we are in a situation where it is shut down the government or pass the simplest, most effective way of getting us across the finish line so that we can move on and really address the concerns that we talked about during our 30-Something hours in the 109th Congress, which was that we are in the worst financial shape that we have been in in decades, that we have a foreign debt that is more combined than any of the 42 previous presidents combined.

And yet they will try to have their cake and eat it, too, criticize us on their budget that we are going to have to continue but, at the same time, not claim responsibility for it. It is really going to be shocking.

So it is something that I think it is important that we talk about and that we lay out there. Because, you know, this process, the appropriations process is one of the most inside baseball, nitty-gritty, intricate things that we do, and there are Members that have been here for years, and I am just, as a new member of the Appropriations Committee, you know, even though I am chairing a subcommittee, I still have a significant learning curve. So explaining it to the people that we represent, while they are watching it all unfold on TV, is really somewhat difficult. So it is critical that people understand that.

I actually talked to some of our colleagues on the floor tonight when we were talking about the CR and, you know, all lamenting that we are not able to craft a bill that we would all love to support with the increases that the veterans deserve and the increases that are deserving in education, that are critical in terms of education and health care and health and human services and housing. I mean, those are all programs that Democrats have campaigned on and fought for. But because we have colleagues that spent like drunken sailors, that had no regard for the fiscal house that we are now charged with putting back in order, we find ourselves having to cinch the belt as tight as possible just so that we can get through and start making things right.

I think each of our colleagues, particularly the freshmen like you, Mr. MURPHY, are going to have an important task of going back to your constituents and explaining that we have got to be responsible here first. Give us an opportunity to get through the mess that we were left and then we can really show you what we can do.

Be happy to yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Just for brief comments, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think you are right. I think the Amer-

ican people, this process may be mystifying to them at some level, but they didn't send us here to just bring back the world. They understood that things needed to be put in order. They understood that there were going to have to be some difficult decisions made here; and, quite frankly, I think they realized that a lot of the decisions that were being made here over the past 12 years, in particular over the last few years, unfortunately, when this government decided to give, they were giving to the wrong people. And, in fact, they found the means to give out some favors, to give out some money. They just happened to be giving it to the people that didn't need anything more.

So we can start making those different decisions. But, before we do that, it is going to take a little while to sweep up the shop room floor. And that is what we are doing now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

What I think is an important point here is that we could have come in and not passed the pay as you go. We could have done the irresponsible thing. And everyone says, well, the Democrats are controlled by all these interest groups. Well, we could have been irresponsible and said this interest group is going to get this and this one is going to get that, and we will borrow the money from China, as Mr. MEEK had the chart up, and we would pay everybody back.

I am telling you, Madam Speaker, she is great. We are doing the right thing. We could have done the easy thing, and we could have paid everybody back and made increases that were irresponsible because we would have continued down the charts where we are borrowing the money from China, paying the interest. They are taking that money, investing it back in their economy, buying submarines and everything else. But we did the right thing. So we have got to take the hit now, but the long-term economic interest of the country is going to be much better off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What we talked about night after night here and what our colleagues and our leadership have all talked about, we have all been singing off the same song sheet, that we have to make sure that we handle the Federal budget just like folks struggle in America to handle their household budget every single day, not to spend more than you take in.

There are families all across America, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MEEK, Mr. RYAN, that have to make really difficult decisions. Would they like to go and buy a new wardrobe for their children? Would they like to get the car completely overhauled? Definitely important and certainly would improve their quality of life, but they can't make those decisions if the money is not coming in in order to cover those expenses.

So at a certain point, if you don't stop the bleeding, if you don't make those fiscally difficult decisions, then it just gets worse.

We could have been, you know, we could have played right into their hands, which is, I am sure, what they expected us to do, which was what they always accused us of being tax-and-spend liberals and that we were going to just give away the store and that we were going to satisfy every interest group that is in the column of supporters that we have.

But, instead, what we did is we stuck to our principles. We stuck to what we talked about was important to the American people, not spending more than you take in and particularly not caving to what would be politically expedient, which was the tax cuts, as you referred to, Mr. MURPHY, for people who don't need them.

Because what they like to conveniently leave out is that they only count, you know, there are only certain things that they count in the ledger. They only count the things in the ledger that are actually things you can put down as I spent this much money on this particular program. But they fail to actually account for the tax cuts that pull money out off the ledger, which makes it so that there is not that revenue available to fund the needs, and that adds to the deficit itself.

They also don't include Social Security and Medicare when it comes to the whole appropriation process. All of that is off budget. They don't like to count the supplemental bills that they pass. All of that is off budget.

So it is just, you know, we are going to get back to being up front and honest with the American people in our budgeting process, and we are going to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And if we get an opportunity as we go through the oversight of the war, oversight of FEMA contracts, there are millions and millions and millions, if not billions, of dollars that have been wasted through the war, the contracting, the Halliburtons. You know, story after story we hear off the record, that is all going to come out through the hearings. You know, if Halliburton has a truck and the tire goes out, they just get rid of the truck and they buy a whole new one. Well, that is at the taxpayers' expense. And there are stories after stories after stories of these kinds of things happening.

So part of what we are doing is we are making the tough decisions today, the responsible decisions today, get into the oversight, find out where the waste is; and I really hope that we continue to push Mr. TANNER and Mr. CARDOZA's bill that says we audit the whole government, because this government is clearly incapable of functioning in the 21st century economy.

If we are going to have the resources that we need, Mr. MEEK, to invest in education, to invest in the health care, to invest into those things that are important, that are going to yield benefits, business incubators and research and development and stem cells like we

did with the corporate welfare to repeal some of that, that was easier to do than getting to the nuts and bolts execution of government, but it is going to be a lot of hard work over the next few years to figure out where we are wasting money, what programs aren't working.

Now we may have and be in agreement that the principle of a program is what we all agree on, end poverty, provide health care for kids, whatever the case may be. But the actual execution of that program may not be yielding the kind of results that we want or at the level we want.

There is still too much poverty. There are still too many kids out there that don't have health care. There are still too many kids that qualify for SCHIP that aren't signed up for it. So, you know, over the course of the next year or two, as we go through the oversight hearings, we are going to be able to determine what programs work, which don't and which ones we need to fix. That is difficult to do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are going to be the Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are going to be the Congress. That is right. We are going to be the Congress.

□ 2230

And, you know, it is not government is the problem, government is wrong, government is your enemy; it is going to be, wait a minute. This is something that is supposed to work and we are going to make it work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I see Mr. MEEK is ready to jump in here. But we are going to be the Congress and exercise our role, our accountability, our oversight, and be the legislative branch instead of the administration lap dog. Because that is what this body was for the last 6 years certainly. When President Clinton was in office, it was the opposite. It was, let's see what we can do to torture the administration and make it impossible for them to get what they wanted done and wanted to accomplish.

Then, of course, President Bush comes into office and it is like they all lost their hands. They lost their hands, they checked their brains at the Chamber door, and it was whatever this administration wanted.

And there is a new leadership in this institution and 32 new Members, all of whom came here to step up to the plate and ask the difficult questions and exercise this body's constitutional role, constitutional authority granted to us by the Founding Fathers, which hopefully at some point our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will remember as well.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think it is important, and Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN, that everybody understand the reason we are here. We are going to play the legislative role. We talked

about the lights being turned on in some of these committee rooms. And I was sitting here kind of looking through a few things, and I grabbed this February 5 edition of Time magazine, and it talked about, Madam Speaker, this upcoming Time I just received it in the mail, only 648 days until the election, why so many candidates are jumping in so early. And it talks about this being the most open Presidential race since 1928.

There is some interesting comments in here and obviously editorials, but I think that you see so many people getting involved because they see a vacuum here, a vacuum of the fact that things are not happening the way that it should happen. And Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ alluded to the fact that, being lap dogs, we sometimes say here on the 30-something Working Group rubber-stamp Congress, what have you, of the 109th Congress. We don't want to be that.

I ran into one of my Republican colleagues in the tunnel walking from the Cannon building over to the House today for a vote and I asked how is a certain piece of legislation. And she responded, well, you know, I have a post office bill. I am not going to belittle, I have done a post office bill before; it is good to identify outstanding Americans. But I just want to make sure that people understand, even here we have what we call suspension bills. Those are bills that we all agree on but it has to be passed by the Congress, Madam Speaker.

But what is happening now that has not been happening, I go back to, I alluded to this earlier, reading is fundamental. We know that some people here in Washington, D.C. don't bother to read newspapers, things of that nature; but we will leave that for another day. Congress Daily A.M., National Journal. And I just want to read what is going to happen tomorrow; today is Monday, what is going to happen on Tuesday. I can tell you, usually this would not be printed in this Congressional Daily Weekly because committees didn't meet. The Foreign Affairs Committee only had one hearing on Iraq in the 109th Congress; thus far, Mr. LANTOS has had five hearings, and we are not even past the first month of the new Congress. This is still January.

Let's see what is happening tomorrow. Armed Services Committee is going to have a hearing on Afghanistan security and stability. Armed Services is going to also have a subcommittee hearing on military personnel. The Budget Committee will meet on the economic outlook of the country in full committee hearing. Education and Labor on generic discrimination of workers. That is happening. That is a subcommittee hearing that is taking place. Energy and Commerce will also have a hearing on the National Laboratory Security, Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee. Oversight Government Affairs and Reform Committee is going to have a climate change politics

hearing; that is a full committee hearing. Science and Technology, Fuels, Infrastructure, Research and Development. That is a subcommittee on Energy. Transportation and Infrastructure, Coast Guard deepwater system, going to have a subcommittee. That is the Coast Guard and Maritime Subcommittee hearing that will take place. Transportation Infrastructure, Railroads, Pipelines, Hazardous Materials, that is a subcommittee hearing that is going to take place. Ways and Means, trade and globalization at 10:00 tomorrow, full committee hearing. Ways and Means once again, subcommittee will be meeting.

I just wanted to point that out, Madam Speaker. If we were in the 109th Congress and the 108th Congress, we wouldn't even be here right now, Monday. We wouldn't even be here on a Monday. People are paying our salary to legislate and to bring about the kind of oversight.

I just want to point that out, because Mr. RYAN spoke a little earlier of the fact that we are actually doing, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what we told the American people we would do, Mr. MURPHY, and that is lead. Six in 2006. Oh, it is a big dog and pony. It is not. We are giving the American people exactly what we told them we would do, which is accountability. And that is a paradigm shift for politicians here in Washington, D.C. I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, and it is. The other day I walked into the Chamber, Mr. MURPHY, from that end of the room, and I noticed that there is a really huge, huge dictionary on the Republican's side of the Chamber which, quite honestly, it doesn't appear has gotten that much use on their side of the aisle, because words like accountability and oversight and checks and balances, and the things that have been with us through American history, maybe they tore the pages out that had those definitions or maybe they just chose to ignore them or just skipped over those pages when they were using it because, obviously we have a dictionary on the floor for a reason, but now, Mr. MEEK, just in great detail went over the number of different hearings that we will be engaging in to exercise the oversight and the accountability that the American people badly are seeking that has just been nonexistent.

And, Mr. MEEK, I want to touch just quickly on one particular bit of oversight that we are going to be engaging in on Wednesday. I have the privilege of sitting on the House Judiciary Committee, and we will be holding our first hearing of the 110th Congress on Presidential signing statements. Now, that is something that we really haven't had a chance to talk about too much on the floor during 30-something, but I would like to explore it down the road a little bit, especially after we hold this hearing.

Most of the American people, I think, don't realize that what this President

has done, and other Presidents, many Presidents have exercised this option, the constitutionality of which I think is somewhat troubling. But this President has used Presidential signing statements more than any other Presidents combined. He has added more than 700 signing statements to legislation that we have adopted in both Houses of Congress. And what he does is he adds a note essentially to the bottom of the bill or to the margin of the bill next to a section that he doesn't agree with and he says: "I either reserve the right to not enforce this section or to interpret this section in this way." I mean, literally taking authority for the executive branch that I believe the Founding Fathers didn't envision. I mean, he did that with the PATRIOT Act, he did that with a number of significant pieces of legislation, Mr. MEEK, and it is really, really troubling.

The executive branch in the Constitution does not have the right to interpret legislation. That is not their job. It is the Judiciary's responsibility to interpret legislation; it is the administration's job to execute what is laid before them by the Congress. Now, he certainly has the right to veto legislation that he doesn't agree with, but he doesn't have a line item veto; he doesn't have a line item veto in the budget, and he can't X out a portion of a bill that he doesn't like. And we are going to be holding a hearing on Wednesday, and we will have the Department of Justice representatives there to question very carefully where they think they get this legislative authority, and reassert Congress's role in oversight in this one area and in many others, as you detailed.

I guess we are in the wrapping-it-up stage, because that is when the Web site chart comes out. I will be happy to yield to our good friend and freshman colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And the guilt is deep inside me that I am stealing Mr. RYAN's thunder for twice in a row here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, life is about letting go.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Moving on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You have got to move on. And you are the guy.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I am glad I can help you with that cathartic experience.

WWW.speaker.gov/30something is where you can find information on a lot of things we have talked about here. I am here to work, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I know there are about 40 other first termers who are here to do the same thing.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Actually, not to be the teacher exercising oversight over the freshman, but probably give out our e-mail address, too, so people know where they can contact us.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The e-mail address is 30SomethingDems@

mail.house.gov. So I like nothing more than to be the student in this relationship, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am with you and the 40-something new Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, it was an honor to come before the House once again. I want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have the hour, and we yield back the balance of our time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2302

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS) at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of district business.

Mr. McDERMOTT (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness in the family.

Mr. HASTERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today, January 30 and 31.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, January 30 and 31.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today, January 30 and 31.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 188. An act to provide a new effective date for the applicability of certain provisions of law to Public Law 105-331.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kareen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on January 25, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 475. To revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

464. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; Miami Sulfur Dioxide State Implementation Plan and Request for Redesignation to Attainment; Correction of Boundry of Miami Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0580; FRL-8270-3] received January 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

465. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso County Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, and Approval of Maintenance Plan

[EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0396; FRL-8272-5] received January 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

466. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Other Solid Waste Incineration Units: Reconsideration [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0156; FRL-8272-2] (RIN: 2060-AN91) received January 19, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

467. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations: Camden, Maine, Penobscot Bay [CGD01-06-084] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

468. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations: Sabine Pass Channel, Sabine Pass, TX [CGD08-06-026] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

469. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the state of the Union; (H. Doc. No.110-1); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. House Concurrent Resolution 34. Resolution honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences (Rept. 110-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. House Resolution 59. Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HODES, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to establish industrial

bank holding company regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SALI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 700. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. INSLER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ISSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the delivery of payments under the program to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 702. A bill to authorize any alien who has been issued a valid machine-readable biometric border crossing identification card to be temporarily admitted into the United States upon successfully completing a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 703. A bill to authorize the Department of Energy to oversee certain safety, security, and health functions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 704. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce from age 57 to age 55 the age after which the remarriage of the

surviving spouse of a deceased veteran shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation otherwise payable to that surviving spouse; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 705. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of George Henry White; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BACA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 706. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2777 Logan Avenue in San Diego, California, as the "Cesar E. Chavez Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 707. A bill to establish the Mountaintown National Scenic Area in the Chattahoochee National Forest, Georgia, and to designate additional National Forest System land in the State of Georgia as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 708. A bill to amend United States trade laws to address more effectively import crises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restrict totalization agreements between the United States and other countries to providing for appropriate exchange of social security taxes or contributions between the parties to such agreements, and to prohibit crediting of individuals under such title with earnings from employment or self-employment in the United States performed while such individuals are not citizens, nationals, or lawful permanent residents of the United States and are not authorized by law to be employed in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself and Mr. INSLER):

H.R. 710. A bill to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donation does not involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that participants in the Troops to Teachers program may teach at a range of eligible schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 712. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 to correct an error in the enrollment of the law that resulted in the omission of two Army construction and land acquisition projects authorized in the conference report (House Report 109-702), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 713. A bill to establish the Niagara Falls National Heritage Area in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HILL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 714. A bill to establish reporting requirements relating to funds made available for military operations in Iraq or the reconstruction of Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WATT, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. REYES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 715. A bill to provide funding for programs at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences regarding breast cancer in younger women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 716. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Santa Rosa Urban Water Reuse Plan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 717. A bill to encourage partnerships between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF,

Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution declaring that it is the policy of the United States not to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and not to exercise United States control of the oil resources of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PORTER):

H. Res. 102. A resolution condemning the assassination of human rights advocate and outspoken defender of freedom of the press, Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink on January 19, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA:

H. Res. 103. A resolution congratulating the Mount Union College Purple Raiders for winning the 2006 NCAA Division III Football National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SPACE, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 104. A resolution honoring and recognizing the life and accomplishments of the late Tom Mooney, president of the Ohio Federation of Teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Resolution No. 6 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to create a federal catastrophe fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16 commending and memorializing the Congress of the United States for passing the Domenici-Landrieu Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 providing for sharing of federal offshore oil and gas revenue with Louisiana for coastal protection and restoration, and congratulating the members of the Louisiana congressional delegation upon their successful efforts in the passage of this legislation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23 memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Constitution Restoration Act, to limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts and preserve the right to the states and to the people to acknowledge God and resolve the issue of improper judicial intervention in matters relating to the acknowledgment of God, all as authorized by Article III, Section 2, of the

United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize Louisiana to lease closed interstate rest areas to private entities in order to provide services and products helpful or desirable to interstate travelers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 23: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 42: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 43: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 44: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 45: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 65: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 100: Mr. HARE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 137: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 156: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 169: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 172: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 180: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOGETT, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 191: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 237: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 241: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 251: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 269: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 271: Mr. POE.

H.R. 312: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 321: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 328: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 333: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 346: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 352: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 358: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 362: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 363: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 365: Mr. HILL, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. HARE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H.R. 402: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 403: Mr. HALL of New York and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 406: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 413: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 418: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 419: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 423: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 446: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 455: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 457: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 460: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 464: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 493: Mr. WU, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 502: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 509: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 511: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CUBIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 518: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 521: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 526: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 545: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. BACA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RENZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WU, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 547: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 551: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 556: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 566: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 569: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 582: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 590: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 592: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 608: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 620: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 627: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 632: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 633: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 636: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 649: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 650: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 651: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 652: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 661: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 676: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 677: Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 684: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 692: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 695: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. OLVER.

H.J. Res. 15: Mr. WU and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Con. Res. 9: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 24: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 26: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 41: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Res. 59: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 64: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 67: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 69: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. POE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WATT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 79: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 87: Mr. WICKER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 90: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 94: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 101: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DAVID R. OBEY

H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.